	Page 1
1	BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
2	
3	
4)
	SPECIAL OPEN MEETING)
5)
)
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
13	Phoenix, Arizona
	January 16, 2002
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	ADTRONA DEPONDING CENTRE INC
20	ARIZONA REPORTING SERVICE, INC.
21	Court Reporting Suite Three
21	2627 North Third Street
22	Phoenix, Arizona 85004-1103
22	+
43	By: CAROLYN T. SULLIVAN, RPR Cortified Court Benerter
24	Prepared for: Certified Court Reporter Certificate No. 50528
25	Cercificate No. 50528
4.5	
<u></u>	

Page 2 1	Page ALSO PRESENT:
Page 3 BE IT REMEMBERED that an Open Meeting was held at the Arizona Corporation Commission, 1200 West Washington Street, Phoenix, Arizona, commencing at 10:00 a.m., on January 16, 2002. BEFORE: WILLIAM A. MUNDELL, Commissioner - Chairman JIM IRVIN, Commissioner ALSO PRESENT: ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION SHELLY HOOD ARIZONA ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE JANFT NAPOLITANO QWEST CORPORATION TIMOTHY BERG JAMES SMITH TIM FYKE ARIZONA COMMUNITY ACTION ASSOCIATION MARY ELLEN KANE ARIZONA CONSUMERS COUNCIL PHYLLIS ROWE ALBERT STERMAN ARIZONANS FOR COMPETITION IN TELEPHONE SERVICE JON POSTON	CHMN. MUNDELL: This is the time set for a special open meeting on Qwest's policies on dissemination of customer information to its affiliates and others. A couple housekeeping items. First of all, if there are any elected officials in the audience, I will, in fact, call them. I think the Attorney General is going to be here. There she is right there. I will be calling her because she's got something else scheduled. Having said that, I do want to make a brief opening statement. The Corporation Commission called this meeting this morning because we were concerned about the privacy of the people of Arizona. We called this special open meeting to discuss the issues of importance to the citizens of Arizona. And I want to say, this appears to be a truly bipartisan issue that has struck a nerve with the people of Arizona. As I said a second ago, the Attorney General is here, there are elected officials, both Democrat and Republican, in the audience that wish to speak. I also want to give special credit to Commissioner Irvin. He actually started the inquiry into the practices of Qwest when he wrote a letter on January 4th to Qwest on this issue. So he deserves

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2

3

5

8

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

Page 6

credit for that, and I want to note that for the record

Let me be blunt. I believe the burden should be on Qwest and not the consumers of Arizona. We need an opt-in rule that is constitutional.

For Qwest to use customers' records in the manner they have proposed in my opinion is wrong, and it is an invasion of privacy. We are talking about the most private records in our society. We are talking about phone records. This is different than a supermarket keeping track of whether you buy Frosted Flakes or oatmeal and whether you like Coke or Pepsi. We're talking about who you call, when you call, how long you call, and how often.

We need an opt-in rule. I believe that Owest should not be allowed to use customer records unless the customer affirmatively allows it. And as I said in this morning's paper, I'm willing to go to court to protect the privacy of the customers of Arizona.

Either of my colleagues have any opening statements they'd like to make?

Commissioner Irvin. We'll go by seniority.

COM. IRVIN: Thank you, Commissioner Mundell.

24 Let me say that I'm here and thank my 25 colleagues for allowing this meeting to take place.

you can see our government at work. And we are 2 listening to you, the people, because you're the ones 3 we work for. And so I thank each and every one of 4 you, as well. 5

CHMN. MUNDELL: Thank you, Commissioner. Commissioner Spitzer.

COM. SPITZER: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I think it's important to come to grips with 01 what this matter is about as well as what it is not about. There were a few eyebrows raised, and I begged the indulgence of the Chairman, when we had the line siting case when I discussed Rousseau and the social 14 compact. And I think that is as essential today as it 15 was during that line siting case.

This is not about just another corporate marketing disaster like the Edsel or the XFL or new Coke. This invokes a fundamental American value placed in the Constitution of this country and placed in the Constitution of Arizona, and that is, the right to privacy.

This is not about telemarketing. Telemarketing is one of those things that people complain about, but all the demographic studies and economic studies show that it's successful. A lot of

Page 7

This Commission has been flooded by numerous calls and complaints regarding this policy that was put out.

I might even, depending on how today's 4 proceedings go, to even add another caveat to Commissioner Mundell's proposed ideas and plans, and 6 that is, making an assumption that Commissioner 7 Mundell's idea of an opt-in plan -- whether it does or doesn't receive support, we'll find out or where we go from there. But also to give some value added that 10 if, in fact, consumers -- this information from consumers, proprietary information, is going to be

11 12 made available for profiteering, that there should be

13 something in it for the consumers. So I will look at

14 trying to tie a discounted rate onto that information 15 so that consumers can certainly benefit and receive

16 something in that mind and will ask our Legal 17

Department to look and see that that is done, 18 depending on how today's descriptions go.

19 I do want to thank my two colleagues, 20 Commissioner Mundell and Commissioner Spitzer, for

21 their support in this endeavor. And I do want to 22 thank most importantly the people of Arizona for

23 standing up as one and voicing their objection to this

24 and bringing this to the attention of the Corporation 25 Commission and letting us know how you feel so that

folks complain about violence and sex on television,

2 and then the ratings for Temptation Island seem to be 3 very high. So people seem to complain about

4 telemarketing, but it is economically viable because 5

there's a willingness of folks to endure this what I 6 find to be a hassle but nevertheless is commercially 7 successful.

But this case is not, contrary to the opinion of the Tenth Circuit, about telemarketing, and it's not about the First Amendment. Again, this case is about a fundamental American and Arizona value, and that is, the right of privacy.

We are here because the former U S WEST, now Qwest, challenged a ruling from the Federal Communications Commission which had adopted an opt-in rule. And the company was successful before the Tenth

16 17 Circuit Court of Appeals in overturning that rule, and

18 we are here in ultimate goal of protecting the rights

19 of privacy by building, whether it's this proceeding 20 today or future proceedings, in accordance with

21 Commission rules and due process and rule of law, a

22 factual record to sustain an opt-in provision, which,

23 again, unfortunately, was overturned by the proceeding 24

in the Tenth Circuit. 25

A quote from the CEO of Owest that the

Page 9

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

24

25

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Page 10

company was simply following the FCC rules in my opinion was a fundamentally dishonest statement since 3 the FCC had promulgated rules that Qwest or U S WEST, the predecessor entity, challenged in court, was successful in overturning. So to say that the company was simply following the rules when it proposed through its notice to the citizens of Arizona to use this confidential information, again, to me, is fundamentally dishonest.

We have, unfortunately, before us what I view to be a horrendous decision by the Tenth Circuit. And as a lawyer -- I've been a lawyer for 20 years now -you win cases, you lose cases. But this one was tough to swallow. And the more times I read this opinion, the more disheartened I became.

I have to point out, while we're talking about disclosure here, that I mentioned that the briefing of the case suggested that Lawrence Tribe had represented U S WEST in raising the First Amendment issue, who's, of course, a noted Harvard law professor and attorney generally associated with liberal cases. My aide, Paul Walker, said, Well, I bet you the judge that wrote the opinion was a Reagan appointee who graduated from Michigan Law School. And sure enough, the judge who wrote in my view the erroneous opinion

would take a clean look and a different view and with a different record, a different factual record, and come to the conclusion as the Chairman mentioned and my colleague Commissioner Irvin mentioned, which with I agree, that the opt-in is better public policy for the state than opt-out.

Finally, we are dealing with a regulated utility here. And in my view, there is an expectation of privacy that does not exist with other commercial enterprises, retail enterprises, banks, and the likes. When you purchase a magazine subscription, I think at heart, the consumer has a reasonable expectation that their name is going to end up on a mailing list. And they may not be happy about that, but that certainly is an expectation that exists.

In the area of regulated utilities, when a customer subscribes to the telephone service local exchange, they believe they're receiving a dial tone. They don't have any reasonable expectation that the information set forth in the Qwest notice, which is the so-called CPNI, which we'll have greater discussion of later today, will be disseminated publicly. Again, the customers feel that they're purchasing a dial tone. That's the consideration, not the expectation that this information will be used.

Page 11

is a Wolverine, but maybe we'll have another Wolverine here today trying to render some justice.

What I think was disturbing, again, was the -- I get back to what this case was about and what it's not about. The majority opinion would have you believe that this is about telemarketing. The judge analogized Qwest's marketing efforts to the distribution of handbills in revolutionary times. Well, in 1787, if you didn't want to take a handbill, you could walk around. You didn't have to accept the handbill. The intrusiveness of the invasion of privacy proposed by Qwest is analogous to the distributor of handbills in 1787 entering your home at 2 in the morning and dropping the handbill on your bed while you slept. It's not analogous and it's wrong.

The Court also, in what I think will be ultimately an infamous footnote, described how the right of privacy can be a nuisance. And that's a view that I do not believe that's shared hopefully by the majority of the judiciary in this country nor certainly in my view by the majority of the citizens nor by the elected officials. And if and when it's appropriate for further judicial review of this

24 matter, I would certainly hope that the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals or ultimately the U.S. Supreme Court 1 We have in my view two serious loopholes in 2 the status of the current law that need to be examined 3 very fully by this Commission and a full factual 4 record needs to be undertaken. 5

The first is the definition of commercially reasonable, which I think opens the door to a lot of potential mischief. That's a term that needs to be defined.

Secondly, the so-called Qwest family of companies. That seems to be very open-ended. Qwest could buy Pizza Hut tomorrow. Are we going to start receiving solicitations from Pizza Hut because my records show that I call Domino's? Is that, again, commercially reasonable? And does this, by virtue of the definition of Qwest family of companies, open the door to even further mischief?

contract that I discussed at the open meeting earlier this month. Certain obligations are imposed upon us to live in a free society. And maybe, Mr. Chairman, the situation with Enron will result in a reexamination of corporate governance in this country, and I hope that is the case. I hope that is the case. Because, as I said at the prior meeting, corporate

America seems to be obsessed with quarterly earnings

I think, again, let's get back to the social

Page 13

2

3

4

5

8

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

l I

12

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 14

statements. A great degree of power has devolved to institutional investors. They seem to think that folks buy and sell mutual funds based on daily reports. They seem to be insisting in their quest for corporate earnings, improvements, asking corporate leadership to sacrifice for the long term, and nobody elected these folks. The Wall Street analysts who formerly were content to evaluate stocks and say, buy, hold, sell, and look at fundamentals are now 10 purporting to run companies.

And when the Chairman of Qwest says that the Corporation Commission and the Attorney General of the State of Arizona should not be involved in this type of issue, that we should butt out. I think ignores the social contract that all citizens, not just corporate. but all citizens, have with each other and with their government and suggests that the elected leadership of this state is somehow abdicating its authority to these Wall Street analysts, who I don't recall ever moving to Arizona and deciding to run for office. Again, that seems to me an examination of our corporate culture that in light of the Enron

23 bankruptcy and other related developments maybe will 24 cause us to be a little introspective and see how this 25 what we still term the social compact has to do with

1 Napolitano.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ł

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

21

23

24

2 MS. NAPOLITANO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and 3 members of the Commission. My name's Janet Napolitano. I am the Attorney General of the State of 4 5 Arizona, and I appreciate the opportunity you've extended to me here today to appear before you, and I 7 applaud the Commission for taking on this very 8 important issue.

I am here in part because of my experience with Qwest during my tenure in office. This company has a colorful history. We've had to take action twice against them over consumer fraud violations in the last two years. One is a lawsuit still pending. And most recently, I've made my concerns about the opt-in/opt-out problem that we're talking about today known not only to Qwest executive management but also to the public and the Commission.

We're here because Qwest recently announced in a very confusing manner its plan to share customer account information with subsidiaries and outside companies. In its December bill insert, realistically a time when consumers are occupied with the holidays and end-of-the-year matters, telling customers about this plan, Qwest stated the following: "Qwest has a long history of treating customer account information

Page 15

corporate governance in Arizona.

But I look forward not only to this meeting but to the development, Mr. Chairman, of a factual record that will lead to a greater understanding of privacy, the reasonable expectations of the people of Arizona, the underpinning of the Arizona Constitution, which in 1912 directly granted to the people of this state a right to privacy. And I look forward to a successful resolution of this matter; again, with the prime result being the protection of this fundamental American value, the right to privacy.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

13 CHMN. MUNDELL: Thank you, Commissioner 14 Spitzer.

A couple housekeeping items again. We have a listen line; so when you come to speak, please identify yourself for the record when you come to the podium. And we have speaker slips. If you haven't had a chance to fill them out, we have speaker slips outside. You can go out the back door and fill out a speaker slip and get it over to the woman to my right, and we'll call you in order that you, in fact, filled out the speaker slip.

So having said that, I will call at this time the Attorney General of the State of Arizona, Janet confidentially. We think that's one reason you trust us."

The truth is, customers don't trust Qwest. Every day, my office receives numerous complaints about this particular phone company's activities and its overbilling, slamming, and cramming practices. And this plan to sell account information is just one more opportunity for Qwest to mistreat consumers.

On January the 8th, I sent a letter to Qwest

10 CEO Joseph Nacchio detailing my concerns about the way 11 Qwest has chosen to let customers opt-out of having 12 their information sold. The information that the 13 company wants to sell, by the way, is very personal, 14 as has been noted before. This is data that law 15 enforcement agencies have to get a grand jury subpoena or a court order to obtain. It shows when, where, and 17 whom a customer calls. This intimately private 18 information can be used to find out which doctors, 19 banks, merchants, public offices, and anyone else you 20 do business with. It can also tell how long and what hours of the day that you are on the Internet. 22

Now, Qwest states in its vaguely worded insert that it will "share" this information with its affiliates and with third parties "when it is commercially reasonable to do so."

Page 17

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

16

21

23

24

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

Page 18

It's not difficult to imagine that promiscuously distributing this private information for profit will always be viewed by Qwest as "commercially reasonable," giving Qwest carte blanche to traffic in their customers' personal information, as if customers weren't already being solicited by telephone enough.

Now, the type of information we're talking about today has been given the highest level of protection under the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996. In implementing that Act, the FCC in 1998 adopted a rule requiring phone companies to obtain their customers' express permission before sharing this information. This is called opt-in. It's also called common courtesy.

Now, because of the recent Tenth Circuit opinion, the FCC is reconsidering its rule. In the meantime, the FCC is allowing phone companies to choose either the opt-in approach or opt-out. Now, under opt-out, the phone company can automatically sell your account information unless you tell them not to. It's kind of like your teenager leaving you a note after he's left for work that unless he hears from you by 5:00, he assumes he can stay out past curfew on a school night. I have joined with 37 other

financial institutions sent out opt-out notices as required by the federal Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act. The majority of consumers either didn't remember serving receiving the notices, or, at most, merely glanced at them. I'm a lawyer. I didn't understand them. Qwest likely assumed that a majority of its own customers would probably not read the notice or understand it and would, therefore, not opt-out.

Another concern, perhaps most vexing of all: Qwest gave customers only 30 days to object with only one phone number and too few operators to handle customer calls. Many customers who tried calling the telephone number provided were unable to get through, were put on hold for long periods, or were connected with uninformed representatives. Working people were basically left with no time to call since the phone center was not available on nights and weekends. And to add insult to injury, many of those who did manage to get through, myself included, were shamelessly solicited with offers for buying wireless or other services from Owest.

It was only after a letter from this office, public outcry, and extensive news coverage that Qwest extended the deadline and the hours available to call. This is consistent with Qwest's remedial history.

Page 19

attorneys general in writing to the FCC, urging it to again require opt-in consent. And a copy of that letter is attached to my testimony, and I ask that it be put into the record.

Now, given the choice between opt-in and opt-out, Qwest decided against its customers and chose opt-out. As it does when customers try to question their bills or cancel services, Qwest set up obstacle after obstacle in front of customers attempting to get their names off the sales lists.

For example, the only notice that Qwest gave its customers about the right to opt-out was a dense 12 and confusing bill insert which read in the bill: 14 "Qwest account information--the following does not affect your billing." This is kind of like saying, 15 "You don't have to read this." And, in fact, many 17 customers did not read the insert or, after glancing at it, thought it was just another sales pitch from 18 19 Qwest and tossed it. Were it not for the concerns 20 raised by the Commission, by me, and by the media, most customers in Arizona simply would have remained unaware, and Qwest would have been able to profit from their account information.

In deciding to use opt-out, perhaps Qwest was aware of recent surveys showing the experience when Page 21

Page 20

Owest seems to only respond or fix problems when the

Attorney General or the Corporation Commission intervenes or writes a stern letter. Qwest's 3

assertion that it is trusted by customers because it has a long history of treating customer account information confidentially is misguided. This new

policy and the way it has been handled is an egregious abuse of that trust.

I call on Owest to voluntarily rescind its new opt-out policy in favor of opt-in, so that Qwest must obtain its customers' permission before being able to sell their information to other companies. If Owest does not do so. I will work with the Commission to examine writing a rule to require it to do so.

Next, at a minimum, Qwest should provide its customers with an easy -- an additional easy-to-read notice clearly stating Qwest's intentions and the rights of customers regarding their account information.

Qwest should also provide everyone who has called or calls in the future an automatic confirmation that they have taken their name off the sales list.

And if it so chooses to continue with an opt-out policy, Qwest should be required to re-notice

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

2

3

4

5

6 7

8 9

10

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

Page 22

its customers each year with a clearly worded notice that will be easy for the average phone customer to understand.

Qwest's failure to change its policy from opt-out to opt-in is a clear sign that it wants to continue with its anti-consumer practices, profiting from customer information with very little say on the part of those customers. It would also show that Qwest is simply not ready to expand its services and enter the long distance market, where they will have even more access to customers' personal calling information to sell.

The Commission should take the following into consideration: As you know, I've already provided the Commission comments on my opposition to Qwest's entering the long distance market without first getting its consumer house in order.

Qwest's efforts to share their customers' 19 private information comes at the same time that it is 20 seeking to enter the long distance market. Qwest's access to customers' private information gives it a distinct marketing advantage over long distance competitors, who will know nothing about customers or

24 the calls that they make. The effect of Qwest's 25 opt-out program should be taken up by the Commission

may add companies and so forth, just as Commissioner Spitzer recognized in his comments. So the customer really doesn't know ultimately who is going to get this information.

Page 24

Page 25

CHMN. MUNDELL: That's the purpose of this hearing today. We'll be asking a lot of questions after Qwest has an opportunity to make their presentation.

Commissioner Spitzer.

COM. SPITZER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

11 Attorney General, I understand that the 12 public comment period is closed on the FCC proceeding. 13

Where exactly are we with the -- you stated the 37 14 attorneys general participated in that. And what is 15 your expectation of having some reopening of the record to produce a future FCC order that would (a) protect privacy and (b) withstand constitutional 17 18 scrutiny?

MS. NAPOLITANO: We have not had any response from the FCC, and so I couldn't give you a current status report of when they're actually going to take up the issue.

CHMN. MUNDELL: Commissioner Irvin. COM. IRVIN: First of all, thank you, Madam Attorney General. It's nice to see you. We don't get

Page 23

in the upcoming hearing on Qwest's long distance application.

Matters such as this one cannot emphasize strongly enough the need to constantly monitor Qwest's activities for the sake of its customers.

I'm grateful for the Commission's interest in this issue. I appreciate the opportunity to speak with you today. If you have any questions, I'd be glad to answer them.

Thank you very much.

11 CHMN. MUNDELL: Thank you for your comments. 12 In general, I have the notice that you referred to, 13 and you're right. I've got it here, and it says, "The 14 following information does not impact your Qwest 15 billing," which is tantamount to saying, you can throw it in the trash. It's very misleading. It should have said something about important information 17 18 concerning your privacy rights. And so that is 19 something that I intend to deal with and this

20 Commission will deal with in the next notice that goes 21 out. 22 MS. NAPOLITANO: Also note, Chairman Mundell,

23 that in the notice they list some of the affiliated 24 companies of Qwest with whom they will share 25 information, but they also have a line that says, we this privilege to have you come down here.

MS. NAPOLITANO: Over.

2 3 COM. IRVIN: It's a tough street to cross.

4 You've got no traffic lights. 5

MS. NAPOLITANO: Tell me. COM. IRVIN: But let me -- I have a copy

before me of the -- it's titled -- and I don't know if you've seen this, and I'll make your office aware of it. And I've highlighted the part. And it's really the third paragraph on the first page. And it says: Just to be clear, Qwest's policy is to share customer account information only with family of companies and others authorized to help customers get Qwest service.

That's pretty open-ended. Would you agree?

MS. NAPOLITANO: I would agree.

COM. IRVIN: And what -- I really wanted to get my confirmation on that, and I would also like to solicit the assistance of the Attorney General -- and the reason that I am going to propose to this

Commission that we adopt in a rulemaking process that 20 should the courts rule as the Tenth Circuit or the

21 22 Tenth Circuit should be upheld by the Ninth Circuit,

23 should we take this action and which it will surely

24 be, I believe Qwest will take it to court -- and I

25 agree with Commissioner Mundell that I'm willing to

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

23

24

4

5

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 26

fight the court battle, and I trust your office will join us in that endeavor. But that would be, then, if it is upheld, there has to be something in it for the consumers. And I would be looking at a discount policy to be attached with this program to say that if you're going to use this information, then we're going to be allowed -- which I know is in the pure view of the Commission on a ratemaking authority. Would you have any comments on that?

MS. NAPOLITANO: I hadn't thought about it before you mentioned it here this morning, Commissioner, but that is an avenue worthy of exploration. If a customer's personal information is going to be bartered, they ought to have a chance to sell it, not have it taken from them.

COM. IRVIN: Thank you.

MS. NAPOLITANO: Thank you very much. CHMN, MUNDELL: Let's go ahead, then, and

we'll go to the portion of the proceeding -- we'll
give the company an opportunity to respond and explain
their policy to the Commission and to the people of
Arizona. I'm not sure who's going to speak. We have

a number of individuals representing the company.

Go ahead and state your name for the record, please.

Communications, and I am accountable for the customer notification that led to this meeting.

Page 28

Page 29

I want to begin by being clear and stating our policy for sharing customer account information. Qwest shares customer account information only with its family of companies and others authorized to help customers get Qwest services. We do not share this information with anyone else except we may share customer account information where required by law to prevent the unlawful use of services or if we sell that part of our business.

I also want to start, Commissioners, by apologizing for any anxiety that customers may have felt after reading our notice or news articles about that notice.

We sent out a notice I believe that created two problems:

First, it raised some questions about Qwest's
use of account information by not making clear what we
meant by the term commercially reasonable and, more
precisely, what we did not mean by the term in
connection with third party disclosures.

We gave some examples of what we meant by commercially reasonable, including providing account information to companies where service packages

Page 27

MR. BERG: Timothy Berg of the law firm Fennemore Craig on behalf of Qwest Corporation.

With me today I have Jim Smith, who is the executive vice president of consumer markets for Qwest; Theresa Wahlert, who is the Arizona vice president public policy for Qwest; and Tim Fyke, who's a lawyer in the Qwest Public Policy and Law Department.

What we're going to do in terms of our presentation today is have Mr. Smith come up and address you first about what Qwest's policies are, what steps we've taken since this issue has arisen, sort of where we are today with it. And then Mr. Fyke is going to come up and offer a brief summary of sort of Qwest's legal position on the legal issues that have been talked about among you and the Attorney General. Obviously, after that, we're available to answer any questions the Commission has.

Thank you.

20 CHMN. MUNDELL: Thank you. I don't know who 21 you're going to call next.

MR. BERG: Mr. Smith first.

MR. SMITH: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners. My name is Jim Smith, and I am

5 executive vice president of consumer markets for Qwest

1 involving part of a Qwest service, like a DSL line, 2 and part of another company's service, like Internet 3 access, so that the service you order works when the

two companies -- both companies are involved.

Another example might be if we provide account information to a CLEC or a competitive local service provider, if you've chosen them to provide your local service. It's these kinds of third party sharing that we meant to include in our reference to third party disclosures, not selling -- not selling customer account information on the street corner to the highest bidder for whatever use they might make of it

And I think you understand the disclosures we've made are not extraordinary, and perhaps we should have used the phrase commercially routine to show exactly what we meant.

In any case, I want to repeat our policy. We share information only within the family of Qwest companies and others authorized to help our customers get Qwest services. We do not share this information with anyone else except we may share customer account information where required by law to prevent the unlawful use of services or if we sell that part of our business.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

25

Page 30

COM. SPITZER: Mr. Chairman, can you define Owest family of companies. For example, would that include Owest's alliance with MSN for Internet?

MR. SMITH: They are not within the Owest family of companies.

CHMN. MUNDELL: Commissioner, before we start asking questions, I was going to let him finish; and then Representative Hatch-Miller is here, and I was going to call him and get back to asking questions, just from a procedural perspective. I have a lot of questions, also, but I wanted him to finish his presentation, and then I was going to call on another elected official, Mr. Hatch-Miller, and then we'll get back to questions.

COM. IRVIN: You overruled us.

CHMN. MUNDELL: I did.

17 COM. SPITZER: It's the prerogative of the

18 Chair.

19 CHMN. MUNDELL: I have this little gavel.

20 MR. SMITH: I want to be clear,

21 Commissioners, and I was clear in my response to the

22 Attorney General's letter to Qwest that we do not sell

23 customer account information, which is essentially

information about the types of services that a 24

25 customer purchases from Qwest and how those services

privacy notices sent out in 2001 by companies that 2 collect consumer data, such as credit agencies, banks, 3 credit card companies, telemarketers, department 4 stores, and insurance companies. 5

Sharing of information within companies is very common and seems not to have caused great concern before. And to give you some examples, cable operators, like AT&T Broadband and Cox, are allowed to share subscriber information for their own business purposes, including offering telephone services.

Page 32

Page 33

In addition, our research tells us that 20 out of 22, that is to say, 90 percent, of the major newspapers in our local service territory compile customer information through their Web site or subscription lists and share this information within their company or with third parties. Most of these papers offer an opt-out program, as does The Arizona Republic.

Even in the case of personal information as was mentioned earlier within the context of financial transactions, where I think consumers have a very high requirement for privacy, the federal law included an opt-out option that gave consumers the opportunity in advance of the disclosure of personal information to certain third parties to direct that that information

Page 31

are used by the customer. We do not sell this

2 information to anyone. That was made clear in the

3 letter to the Attorney General, in spite of her open

4 statement this morning. And we would not do this

5 without explicit permission. To the extent that

customers reading our legal notice came away with a

different impression, again, I apologize, and I appreciate the opportunity this morning to set the

record straight.

Our notice that we sent out beginning in December followed the Federal Communications Commission guidelines on how to notify customers about the information that we collect and how we will use it in the future. And while other industries have similar rules, the FCC guidelines required us to notify customers and to give them 30 days to decide if they did not want us to use this information.

I also want to note that the FCC also stated that they agree that the sharing of customer account information within one integrated firm does not raise significant privacy concerns because customers would not be concerned with having their account information disclosed within a firm in order to receive increased

23 24 competitive offerings. 25

Our customer notification is consistent with

1 not be disclosed. My own bank that I received a

> 2 notice from has just this kind of a notice, an opt-out

3 provision, and importantly says that one of the

4 reasons that they would want to share information

5 amongst their companies is to keep me informed about

financial services that can meet my needs now and in 7 the future.

8

My interest here is in not selling information to third parties but rather to utilize information in a fashion that can actually serve our customers. To give you an example, let's say one of our customers order an Internet service. They had a single line and ordered an Internet service. Given the nature of dial-up Internet service, it might be assumed that there was going to be people tying up that line to utilize it for Internet access a great deal of time. We might call that customer to suggest to them a second line. If the customer found value in it and ordered it, that would be a good thing for the customer and a good thing for Owest. Additionally, if

19 20

a customer subscribed to our Custom Choice offer, we 21

might decide to give that valuable customer a discount 22

23 on a long distance service offering if we understood

24 how they were ordering their services from us.

I want to make it clear that Qwest will honor

9 (Pages 30 to 33)

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

Page 34

requests from customers that their account information

- not be shared and we will not begin sharing this
- information inside the company until March 29th. We
- will also confirm, as was mentioned in our letter to
- 5 the Attorney General, in response, we will also
- 6 confirm with customers their decision not to
- 7 participate in the information sharing process.
- 8 Furthermore, customers can advise us at any time after
- 9 March 29th that they don't want account information
- 10 shared within Qwest and on a going-forward basis, and
- 11 we will honor that request. Even so, I believe some
- 12 customers have responded to the notice we sent by 13 experiencing anxiety.

This led to the second problem. We got more customer calls than we expected, and we got them in a shorter period of time than we expected. And we have taken three steps to remedy that situation:

18 First, we began at the beginning of last week 19 bringing on additional specially trained

- 20 representatives, now totaling more than 290, to take
- 21 customers' calls specifically wanting to talk with us
- about their CPNI request and an ability to opt-out. 22
- 23 Beginning this past weekend, we extended to Saturdays
- 24 and Sundays the hours that people can speak with a
- 25 Qwest representative.

14

15

16

17

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

21

22

23

24

25

speak because the Legislature's in session, and then 2 I'll bring you back up for questions from myself and the other Commissioners.

Representative Hatch-Miller, welcome.

REP. HATCH-MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. I certainly appreciate the opportunity to come over and talk with you this morning.

You already know that as the chairman of the Energy, Utilities & Technology Committee in the House, I've been dealing with this issues of privacy for some time. So to have this opportunity that you're providing by having this meeting so quickly on this issue is an important one to me, and I thank you for that.

I want to remind all of us that the issue of privacy in telecommunications has been one with a long history. I can remember back when I was a young boy, we still had a party line at my house, and we were very concerned about whether someone at another home was listening in on our conversation. And that was many years ago. And privacy was a concern then, and privacy continues to be of certain now. It's a

different kind of privacy, perhaps, but still one of

just as much importance.

Page 35

Secondly, we have improved our Web site so that more customers can access that Web site simultaneously.

And third, beginning last night, we have launched an automated voice response set-up on our 1-800 number so that customers who want to tell us that they don't want Qwest to share information inside the company can do so without waiting to speak to a customer representative. I checked this morning, Commissioners, and my understanding was as of about 9 or 9:15, we had a three-second wait time for customers wanting to get in and talk with us.

13 Now, I say again, I regret any 14 misunderstanding. We certainly value the 15 confidentiality of customer information, and we 16 certainly guard it carefully, and we always have. 17 What information we use, we use only inside Qwest or 18 with authorized representatives, and we use it only 19 for very narrow purposes. And we have made it easier 20 for our customers to say, thanks, but no thanks.

Thank you very much, Commissioners, for the opportunity to be here today, and I'd be happy to answer any questions that you might have now or --CHMN. MUNDELL: Sir, as I said, I'm going to

give Representative Hatch-Miller an opportunity to

And I believe that Qwest, like a doctor or lawyer or even our videotape store, has a responsibility to protect information that we would find sensitive that we want to protect from the prying eyes of our neighbors and others. And Qwest is assuring us -- and just listening to some of the presentation -- that they have in place a limitation on the types of information that would be shared and how it would be shared, and I take them at their word on that, that that is the case.

But I believe that what we need to look for is a community standard. What would a rational person -- what would rational people expect to be protected and expect to be private. And that we establish that by rule as what we expect in Arizona. And I would like to see us proceed on rules of that type. Again, I think there's a delicate balance between a free market and a free people that have a right to privacy. That balance point is what we want to achieve. And I believe that we should ask Qwest and others to work with us in that regard and members of the public to find that balance point for Arizona and establish it by rule and proceed from there.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHMN. MUNDELL: Thank you, Representative

Page 37

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

9

10

11

13

18

19

20

21

22

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Page 38

Hatch-Miller, for your comments. Thank you very much. Mr. Smith, you can go ahead and come back to

the podium. I'm sure we have a number of questions for you.

COM. IRVIN: Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of questions, very basic questions, if I could, sir.

CHMN. MUNDELL: Certainly.

COM. IRVIN: Mr. Smith, a couple of points that I found that -- and very basic, I leave my colleagues to ask the legal questions as they have a legal background. I have more of a business background, so I'll cut to the chase.

You know what has amazed me, and even in your presentation and in the notices and even the notices that I've got here -- and I've got a bunch of them -is to get Qwest to identify what specific information

17 they're disseminating is like pulling teeth. You, in 18 your presentation to the Commission, identified and

19 said, we're not going to use information, but you

20 never said what information it is. I think

21 Commissioner Spitzer pointed out, and correctly so,

22 that if Qwest and their family buys I think he used

23 the expression Peter Piper or Pizza Hut, and he uses a

24 different pizza house, is he going to start getting

25 phone calls to solicit that? You've got some very

And the public, as they sit today, still has no idea what information -- I mean, there is basic telephone 3 information that is -- I would concur that's open 4 access, but there's other information: when calls are 5 made, what special services you're using on the phone.

Page 40

Page 41

what Internet services, all kinds of things. That is proprietary, and my colleagues have pointed that out. 8 And that's a long question; but you haven't

addressed those yet, and I think the public deserves to have answers.

MR. SMITH: Commissioner, I appreciate your questions.

12 Let me first address the notion that we are 14 in a unique position. Certainly on a historical 15 basis, there was not much competition within the 16 telecommunications industry. It's my understanding in talking with Teresa Wahlert -- and I'm sure that you 17 can confirm this -- that we have over 100 certificated providers in the state of Arizona. As somebody that is responsible for the financial success of the consumer division, I can tell you specifically that we understand the competition that exists between ourselves and Cox, between ourselves and AT&T in the

23 provision of local services. So we operate in what is

an increasingly competitive marketplace where I

Page 39

sensitive information.

I think Representative Hatch-Miller pointed out that the sensitivity of these -- and what I'm getting at is to point out, the difference is, your utility bill is a bill that citizens in Arizona use to identify and get library cards and schools use to identify that you qualify to go to school in that particular school district. So that information is accurate. Whereas, all the other information from all the other entities that you put may or may not be accurate.

12 And one of the differences that you pointed out, and, again, I have a problem with it, in all your 13 examples, AT&T, Cox, the bank, they're all unregulated entities that consumers have choice. The consumers in 15 16 Arizona, as we sit today, do not have choice of who provides them with dial tone. And Owest is --17 18 although they may not admit it -- but Qwest is a 19 wholly regulated entity in this state. And I think 20 that is part of mine and my colleagues' frustrations 21 up here. And I find it extremely dissatisfying that 22 in your comments, you drew a distinction to try to 23 throw the Commission off, but the distinction is

regulated versus unregulated, and you are regulated. 24 And you still haven't identified what those items are. believe that we have to have an opportunity, as do

other providers of services, to market our services in

a fashion that is No. 1, reasonable, certainly

protects the reasonable expectations of privacy, but 5 that is on a par with what other telecommunications

6 providers are permitted to do in providing their own 7 services. 8

Now, with respect to the information -- and I would ask our counsel, given an opportunity, to specifically address how the Federal Communications Commission would define customer proprietary network information because specifically that's what we're dealing with here. But as a basic proposition, it is that information that suggests what kind of services that you subscribe to and how you utilize those services.

Now, I use --

CHMN. MUNDELL: Mr. Smith, let me cut to the quick. Does that include who you call, when you call, where you call, how often you call? Let's just talk basic English here so everyone can understand it.

Who you call?

23 MR. SMITH: Yes. 24

CHMN. MUNDELL: Where you call?

25 MR. SMITH: Yes.

Page 42 Page 44 1 CHMN. MUNDELL: When you call? the selling of their services, and we provide 2 MR. SMITH: Yes. customers an opportunity to suggest that we not 3 CHMN. MUNDELL: How often you call? 3 utilize their information even within our family of 4 MR. SMITH: Yes. 4 customers. 5 CHMN. MUNDELL: Thank you. 5 CHMN. MUNDELL: Let me ask you this question, 6 MR. SMITH: That information is all included Mr. Smith. Who is your family of customers -- of 7 within the purview of customer proprietary network 7 companies? You've used that terms in your notice, and 8 information. 8 you've used it here today. What is Qwest's family of 9 COM. IRVIN: And, Mr. Smith -- excuse me, 9 companies and where can that list be found so that 10 sir. 10 myself and --11 MR. SMITH: If I could respond to --11 COM. SPITZER: Excellent question. 12 COM. IRVIN: Let me add --12 CHMN. MUNDELL: Thank you, Commissioner 13 CHMN. MUNDELL: One at a time, gentlemen. 13 Spitzer. 14 COM. IRVIN: Let me add one more caveat to 14 MR. SMITH: I believe that actually in the 15 that. You've now told Commission Mundell that -- and 15 notice, there was a discussion of the family of 16 that's what I suspected. But to the general public, customers. We have our Qwest wireless division that 17 they don't have easy access to the FCC rules. Why 17 provides cellular and PCS services. We have Qwest 18 would the company not be more honest -- and I think 18 Dex, which is our directory publishing business. We 19 the Attorney General pointed it out -- and forthright 19 have our Internet business that provides Internet 20 and come right out and say, these are, in fact, the 20 access services. We have our local business, which 21 type of services and information we're asking for. 21 is -- I am a part of in the consumer division. And we Instead, you hide under the cloak of saying it's under 22 have our long distance company, as well. Those are 23 FCC rule or some obscure regulation that we as 23 the Qwest family of companies. 24 regulators and you in the industry know what it is, 24 CHMN. MUNDELL: So other than those that you 25 but John Q. Citizen doesn't know, and it's frustrating 25 just named, there's no other family of Qwest companies Page 43 Page 45

1

7

8

9

17

18

19

21

23

24

25

and annoying to the consumer, and they're put at a 1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

And I have to agree with the Attorney General that you're opening -- that the opening statement is even more accented that we think this is one reason you trust us. I think, with the Attorney General, it's a reason the public doesn't trust Qwest, is because they are being disingenuous and they're hiding when the truth is a better answer. I'm sorry for interrupting you, but --

MR. SMITH: Mr. Commissioner, I do not agree with you that we are being disingenuous. I think, as a matter of fact, our disclosure was considerably more lengthy than that that has customarily gone out from other communications companies, and the vast majority of communication companies have sent out these notices.

17 I want to make very clear what our policies 18 19 and practices are. Again, I want to reiterate that I 20 understand, Mr. Chairman, that the kind of information 21 that we know is incorporated into customer proprietary 22 network information is very sensitive, but I want to make clear that that's why we have very strictly limited its use. We do not provide it to third

parties for their use in telemarketing practices or

that you'll be disseminating this information to? MR. SMITH: Yes.

2 3 CHMN. MUNDELL: Let me ask this question, 4 then: When that particular family of companies 5 changes, which it probably will in the future, how will that information be given to the public? 6

suggest that we were going to be sharing this information within the Owest family of companies. And 10 I believe that that notice would indicate that if

MR. SMITH: The intent of the notice was to

11 there were another company that happened to be created for the provision of a service that I can't 12

anticipate, that the notice already indicated that 13 14 that information would be shared and the customers

15 have an opportunity to have us not share that 16 information if they show choose.

CHMN. MUNDELL: And then the term -- I think Commissioner Spitzer started to ask you the question, and I wanted to get to the representative. What does commercially reasonable mean to Qwest?

20 MR. SMITH: Again, as I stated in my 22 introductory comments, I think -- and I'm in agreement with the Commission that commercially reasonable is not well understood. We would share information with third parties where it is critical for the delivery of

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

[]

12

13

14

15

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

Page 46

a service. And I use the example that if we sold a high bandwidth line and a customer had a particular Internet service provider, we might have to indicate the speed of that line to the Internet service provider in order to have that service completed in a reasonable fashion.

We might have to share information with a party that is selling on our behalf. We have our own sales agents, but we also contract for sales agents. If they utilize account information for selling at our behest as our authorized agent, we do not allow them to use that information for any purpose that goes beyond specifically acting as an agent on our behalf.

We might utilize that information if you decided to subscribe to a competitor of ours at the 15 16 local level. We would share that account information because you have suggested that that's who you want to 17 18 be served by. If we sold a portion of the business to 19 another party where you're continuing to receive service might require that information be available to the person purchasing or the entity purchasing that 21 part of the business. That would be another example. 22

I cannot run beyond those examples, 23 24 Mr. Chairman, to suggest to you what would be commercially reasonable. I just want to state clearly

companies, but they're a separate entity that you, in fact, have provided information to. 2

3 MR. SMITH: That is operating as an agent for 4 sales and the delivery of Owest services.

CHMN. MUNDELL: Let me ask you this: Has any -- well, okay.

Page 48

Page 49

COM. IRVIN: Mr. Chairman, can I follow up on a question. Because you've alluded to a problem, and, again, I think -- I think trying to get answers is like pulling teeth.

But let me go to a letter in the response that Ms. Wahlert wrote to me. She wrote -- and this is on the shared information. It says: With the family of companies. And then it specifically states here: And others authorized to help customers get Qwest service.

Who is that? That's not part of the Qwest family.

MR. SMITH: Let me again utilize the example, Mr. Commissioner, of us providing a high bandwidth line, and you have subscribed to an Internet access provider. We would provide that Internet access provider the characteristics of that particular circuit so that service might be delivered. That would be an illustration.

Page 47

that we are not selling this information to third parties unaffiliated that want to utilize this information for their own marketing purpose.

CHMN. MUNDELL: Let me ask you this, Mr. Smith -- and certainly correct me if I'm wrong. Hasn't some of this information been either given or sold to Microsoft, your net providers? Explain that to me.

MR. SMITH: It has not been sold to Microsoft. Microsoft has a co-marketing arrangement with us. They sell a combined offer of DSL service and their MSN Internet service. They can utilize any account information only for the purpose of providing that combined package that incorporates a Qwest offering.

CHMN. MUNDELL: So they're not --16 17 MR. SMITH: Let me be clear, Mr. Chairman. 18 They could not take our customer information and decide that they wanted to sell the next version of 19 Windows and utilize their list in that kind of a 21 fashion. That would be completely contrary to our 22 agreement with them, our contractual agreement with 23 them.

24 CHMN. MUNDELL: So they're not a member of, 25 obviously, to use the term of Qwest family of

And understand, I can't give you a litany of 1 examples because we just have sent out this notice. 2 We are not utilizing this information in this fashion. 3 But where it is critical for us to share this 4 information with someone that is aiding us in the 5 delivery of service, those are the circumstances under which this information would be shared and not beyond 7 that. We would not give permission to them to utilize 8 it for other purposes. 9

COM. IRVIN: We have an issue of trust. And your family is kind of like a rabbit. It's growing as we speak here today.

And the other comment I've got, again, to follow up with the Chairman's questions, is "in the future, we may change our structure and enter new businesses." Your family just got bigger. The public doesn't know.

And the other thing that you haven't described, and I know the Chairman mentioned it on the radio this morning -- and I'll take a little bit of his thunder, and he can follow up with it -- is what assurances does the public have that this information is even protected? Because when they call in -- and I just had my chief of staff call, and he did get through to your number, so I'll give you credit for

13 (Pages 46 to 49)

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

6

7

8

that.

2 MR. SMITH: Was it in three seconds? 3

COM. IRVIN: I don't know how long. He didn't tell me that. He said he did get through and he did verify the opt-out. So he's opted out. He's done better than me on it. Anyway, unfortunately, and this is a complaint that I've heard from many constituents, that there's been no confirmation given

that the phone company has even received the information, that the phone company has even given a confidentiality or notification that this information

is now protected or anything.

And quite frankly -- and I'll pick up on the 13 14 Attorney General -- outside of your word, as Representative Hatch-Miller mentioned, which I think 15 16

many consumers are suspect of, what assurances do 17 consumers have that their proprietary information is

18 protected? When Qwest files information at this

Commission, they file information under proprietary 19

20 rights, and this Commission honors those rights. I,

as a consumer and as a subscriber to Qwest services, 21

22 because I have no choice, would expect the same thing,

but I'm hearing a different message from Owest today.

And as a consumer, I'm concerned. As a Commissioner, 24

25 I'm irate

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

14

15 16

17

Page 50

easy to do. I'm just giving some suggestions here off the top of my head. The person doesn't have Internet 2 capability. You put it in a fax. When you send your 4 bill out, you put in some kind of indication they've 5 opted out.

Page 52

Page 53

And then I have a question, and first of all I'll preface: Are you sending out the notice also in Spanish?

9 MR. SMITH: The original notice? 10

CHMN. MUNDELL: Or the subsequent one that

11 you said you're going to be sending out. 12

MR. SMITH: Again, we have not yet -- and I appreciate your suggestions as to methodology. 13

14 Mr. Chairman. As I indicated, we have not solidified

15 what the process is going to be for confirming with

16 our customers, but we will do it in a fashion which

17 assures to the greatest extent possible that they

18 understand that their request has been received and

that it has been honored. 19

20 CHMN. MUNDELL: We know in Arizona we have a

21 number of Spanish-speaking people. And so Qwest

22 doesn't feel like we're picking on you guys, because I

23 know what's how you feel, we've recently required

Southwest Gas to send out their notices in Spanish.

And I look at this, and I read it. If I -- looking at

Page 51

6

7

8

9

MR. SMITH: Commissioner, I believe that you had three different questions.

First of all, I am hopeful that Owest as a company would grow and would offer additional services

that consumers would find valuable in a competitive marketplace. That is a principle of business. The way that you do that is you come to the marketplace with valuable services. And valuable in the sense that customers perceive them to be of value. So that

10 is very much my objective. I believe that's what American business is about. 11

Secondly, in terms of confirmation, we will be confirming with every customer that chooses to opt-out the fact that they have chosen to opt-out. And we're building that mechanism, and we'll be happy to provide the Commission and the Commission Staff with precisely what that procedure will be.

CHMN. MUNDELL: So you'll be sending 18 19 something in writing -- it seems to me that you can 20 send out all your advertising on a regular basis, you 21 get inundated with it, that someone could sit down and 22 develop a strategy to send out a confirmation letter, 23 put it in the bill stuffing so it doesn't cost any 24

more postage, put a little star on the billing that 25 indicates you've opted out. It seems to me pretty this, not only is it misleading in my opinion, as I

said earlier, it says, don't worry about this because 3 it doesn't impact your Owest billing and trash it.

And then I made a note to myself, it seems to me it 5

should be in Spanish, also.

COM. SPITZER: We'll start with English first, Mr. Chairman.

CHMN. MUNDELL: That's good. But we ought to move along and make sure that we have informed

10 consent. It seems to me that the basis of a notice

requirement -- and if you're saying that you're going 11 to use the opt-out that it ought to be -- a person 12

ought to have informed consent to make an intelligent 13 decision. 14

15 And to the notice, I wanted to ask you a 16 question. You're not suggesting -- or maybe you

were -- that the wording in the notice is what was 17 18 required by the FCC. I mean, you had some leeway

because I've seen notices from SBC and from some other 19

20 providers. So just to make sure the record is clear, 21 this verbiage that you used was not drafted by the

22 FCC, it's what you all came up with at Owest.

23 MR. SMITH: That's correct, Mr. Chairman. 24 CHMN. MUNDELL: I just wanted to be sure the

25 record was clear.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

25

Page 54

MR. SMITH: I believe Commissioner Irvin had another portion of the question that he had asked; and that is, what assurance do we have that Owest is trust worthy on a long-term basis in terms of the utilization of this information.

And my response to that is: I operate in a competitive marketplace. And if I violate the trust of my customers, I'm not in business anymore. I mean, that's ultimately the determination for me. If I do not understand honor and respect, the requirements that my customers have for the protection of their information, they do, in fact, have choices available to them. They will take those choices, and I deserve to have them take those choices. That's my assurance as a business person in a competitive market.

COM. IRVIN: Mr. Smith, if we had a competitive marketplace, I would concur with you. But much to my colleague Commissioner Spitzer's ridicule from time to time, I live in north Scottsdale for better or for worse. I don't have a choice of another local service provider. So where do I go if I believe you've violated my trust or I don't like this policy, how do I get local dial tone?

23 24 MR. SMITH: I could --

25 COM. IRVIN: The answer is I don't. 1 comment.

15

24

25

1

2 3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 CHMN. MUNDELL: Mr. Smith, let me just 3 interject something for the audience.

Page 56

Page 57

4 I think it's important to reflect on how 5 lucky we are to live in this country where we have freedom of assembly, freedom of speech, but we need to 7 be civil. And I will let everyone have an opportunity 8 to speak, but please don't shout out. We make 9 decisions in this country in a democracy based on 10 information and not at the point of a gun. So I would 11 appreciate the audience showing some civility and respect. We've called this meeting because we are 12 13 concerned about your privacy, but please don't shout 14

Thank you.

16 COM. IRVIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 17 CHMN. MUNDELL: Commissioner Spitzer. 18 COM. SPITZER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

19 I'm going to reserve some of the legal issues 20 to your attorney folks, and maybe I'll stick with the marketing just for the time being. 21

22 Qwest chose to litigate -- elected to 23 litigate the FCC opt-in and reverse it for an opt-out.

MR. SMITH: Its predecessor company, U S

WEST, did, yes, sir.

MR. SMITH: Well, the answer is -- and I can give you facts and data on this -- increasingly, people decide that they'll get their local dial tone off of a wireless service. I have many customers that --

COM. IRVIN: Mr. Smith, I want hard wire service. I want the phone service. I'm entitled to -- it's a policy of this state that I am entitled to have access to that. I think that is a cop-out of an answer to give me I can go to wireless. Yeah, I have wireless phones now, too.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Commissioner, with due 12 13 respect, I don't think that it is a cop-out.

(Shouting from audience.)

CHMN, MUNDELL: Wait. Wait.

MR. SMITH: This is an increasingly competitive environment. If I establish a reputation

for this business that would suggest when service is available to you and it surely will, just like it's

20 available for so many tens and hundreds of thousands 21 of subscribers from Cox Communications in this

22 community, I can't have these kinds of policies and

23 expect to have a healthy business. That's it, pure 24 and simple. That's my motivation.

COM. IRVIN: I would agree with that last

Page 55

COM. SPITZER: And I'm assuming that there were business reasons for that. Lawyers typically don't take cases without some direction from management, so I'm assuming there was a management determination that opt-in -- or opt-out was better for the company from a marketing point of view; is that correct?

MR. SMITH: That is correct.

COM. SPITZER: And in the Tenth Circuit opinion -- now, this is a majority opinion that struck down opt-in -- explained by opt-in in the Court's view restricted the company's marketing opportunities. You're familiar with that?

MR. SMITH: I am. And I know that you're versed in this decision, Commissioner. I believe that the decision was that the Court believed in the free flow of information within a free economic system to ensure the efficient delivery of products and services. I believe that was the fundamental theory of the decision.

COM. SPITZER: And that the company had performed surveys under an opt-in version that showed consumers were reluctant to dispense with their privacy rights. Wasn't that part of the Court's opinion?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

24

25

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Page 58

MR. SMITH: I think beyond the statement that I just made, perhaps that question would best go to counsel.

COM. SPITZER: We've seen a firestorm here. and I'll tell you, I heard it at my Rotary Club Friday. I was sitting having lunch, and I was a captive audience. And I heard it from liberal Democrats, I heard from conservative Republicans. The issue of privacy seems to cut across party and philosophical lines, and I think that's a good thing.

Don't the problems with your unanticipated response or the citizens of Arizona causing a flooding of the lines and causing the company to hire more folks and causing the company to deal with input, causing the company to go out and bring in trained individuals to deal with this narrow issue, causing the company to consider a second insert on the privacy, causing the company to extend the deadline, causing the company to now consider how to in an economically feasible way confirm that folks have opted out, doesn't this all make the case for opt-in? And is the company going to reconsider this fiasco?

23 MR. SMITH: The company has taken steps, many of which you have pointed out, to deal with a 24 situation that we did not properly anticipate, part of

seen all the correspondence, and I know that the company's raised Gramm-Leach-Bliley, financial 2 3 institutions. You understand how a regulated utility 4 which is an essential -- a utility is by definition 5 ubiquitous and essential, is different than some other 6 commercial transaction

Page 60

Page 61

MR. SMITH: I suspect because I get to be on the front lines of what I consider to be a competitive business on a daily basis that you and I have a different view of that, and I believe that I have to have available to me practices that are available to others across industry in competitive marketplaces.

But, again, this belies the notion that 14 somehow we are -- even if you agree with the characterization of us as a utility and somehow differential that we are somehow abusing the utilization, that is not the case. We do not sell this information. We do not allow third parties to utilize it in their telemarketing practices. That simply is not the case.

COM. SPITZER: But you understand how your customers could have a different view. That they would view this utility as different than buying a subscription to Field & Stream magazine. That they would have a different expectation of privacy accorded

Page 59

which was caused by the questions that were raised in the manner in which we put forward our notice.

The company is very interested in ensuring that consumers understand -- have the opportunity to opt-out. The fact is that thus far, we've seen somewhere between 3 and 4 percent of customers opt-out.

COM. SPITZER: To date?

MR. SMITH: To date. That in spite of the fact that as we are all very well aware, given this open meeting and given the coverage of the media -there has been a great deal. As you sat in your Rotary Club, a great deal of understanding of this opportunity. I'm happy to have people have that opportunity. It's why we're very willing to extend the deadline.

17 To your question specifically, Commissioner 18 Spitzer, we do not intend to put forward an opt-in 19 provision, and we feel very comfortable, given the Court's affirmation of our view and given the common practice in American industry, that an opt-out 22 opportunity with appropriate notification is the right 23 course to take.

COM. SPITZER: Mr. Chairman, you understand the distinction, I raised it in my open remarks. I've

their decision to have dial tone as opposed to their decision to go out and buy a magazine.

MR. SMITH: Being a marketing and 3 4 salesperson, Commissioner, I understand very well the 5 differences in viewpoints in almost every regard in 6 the customers that I serve.

COM. SPITZER: And you were surprised -- you say you didn't anticipate this firestorm. You're telling this Commission today that the company is surprised that the people feel the way they do?

MR. SMITH: I am not at all surprised that people have a very genuine and heartfelt interest in the privacy of information that they deem to be confidential. In fact, I was surprised and did not anticipate the volume of interest that we have received. The fact of the matter is, those that went before us did not receive the kind of interest that has been shown by way of example in the state of Arizona. Be that as it may, we're looking at about a 3 percent interest in opt-out thus far. But none of that should be taken to mean that I do not understand people's absolutely legitimate requirements to have the confidentiality of their personal information protected. Well understood and protected. I am in

25 wholehearted agreement with that.

16 (Pages 58 to 61)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

1

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Page 62

COM. SPITZER: 271. The Attorney General alluded to that. In terms of the services offered by the company on a going-forward hypothetical basis, that would extent the Qwest family of companies, would it not, some?

MR. SMITH: Yes, indeed it would.

COM. SPITZER: So my current bill -- I have a competitor of Qwest's for long distance that is being billed through Qwest. That information, the fact that I call my mom in Philadelphia every Sunday night, becomes part of Qwest's marketing endeavors under a post-271 regime. Is that what you're planning?

MR. SMITH: I do not have specific plans. It's now under consideration how we would market to our customers. But what I can assure this Commission is that we will be giving customers a far better deal than incumbents are now providing in this marketplace once we enter the long distance arena.

COM. SPITZER: So, Mr. Chairman, you're saying that you offer a great deal. So the answer to my question is you're going to take my customer proprietary information as a marketing deal and post-271 issue and from a privacy point of view, is that something that this Commission ought to consider in 271? Is that a buried land mine in the 271

dissenting judge, who did not attend the University of 2 Michigan Law School, I thought was extraordinary in 3 talking about the competition issue. Now, what you've just said is in a hypothetical post-271 approval 5 world, you've got a competitive advantage over all the 6 other long distance competitors because you have my

Page 64

Page 65

7 customer proprietary network information, and none of 8 the other long distance competitors do. So what 9 you're suggesting is you're making the argument that

10 this is anti-competitive, are you not?

CHMN. MUNDELL: Let me jump in for just a second because this is a great dialogue back and forth, and this is some great questions; but I'm going to ask our counsel, because of the open meeting notice, this discussion should probably take place in the 271 docket as opposed to here. I mean, those are great questions. I had some of the same ones about you can't have it both ways. And I was going to say, are the competitors going to get the same information, also, which opens a whole new ball of wax, and I don't want to go there today.

COM. SPITZER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I stand corrected.

Final question on this whole marketing issue: What has been the -- the Attorney General said that

Page 63

process?

2 MR. SMITH: I would not refer to it as a land 3 mine. I do want to make clear that under the notice 4 that was sent and under the FCC CPNI rules, if you 5 choose not to opt-out, we could use customer 6 proprietary network information in our marketing 7 practices as we enter into the long distance business. 8 But, again, I would put forward the question of what 9 utility is that to customers. If we are able to 10 determine by way of example that you are a heavy user 11 of long distance services between Phoenix and Arizona 12 and that we want to provide you a special rate for 13 that calling or a special rate for a particular time 14 of the day -- or, as an example, a very popular 15 offering that MCl came forward with years ago, Friends 16 & Family, where there is an opportunity for commonly 17 called numbers for you to receive a very beneficial 18 rate, I think that that is of great benefit, and I 19 don't view it to be abusive. We obviously are not 20 going to put you on a plan without your concurrence, but --

21 22 COM. SPITZER: I understand, but -- not only 23 looking at the privacy issue, but there was a competitive issue that was raised before the Tenth 25 Circuit. And, frankly, with all due respect to the

l when she called in to opt-out, she received some solicitations from your wireless folks, wireless 2 products. Given the -- again, the firestorm in this 3 state regarding people's interest in privacy, I'm sure 4 5 you track this on a daily basis. How have your 6 marketing efforts been going to Arizona? 7

MR. SMITH: I've got to say that just as a general proposition, the economy is soft in all of the places we serve and business is down.

COM. SPITZER: In the last couple of weeks since it's hit the papers, Saturday -- what was it, the 4th?

MR. SMITH: I can't give you the Arizona-specific information. And business has been on a par with what I found it to be in December.

But I want to make clear that the people that -- the routing that we're now going through -first of all, we have up as of about 9:30 last night this opportunity to call in on an automated basis and opt-out and ultimately receive a confirmation. So that is dealing only with the CPNI opt-out position. Also, these 290 people that are on board, they are

22 23 dealing only with information that is related to the

24 CPNI opt-out, not a selling practice. We have not

25 trained them in selling.

17 (Pages 62 to 65)

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

Page 66

I can't -- Mr. Commissioner, with 3,000 people on the front line, I can't tell you that there has not been a circumstance where somebody attempted to sell a wireless offering if they got into our business office and wanted to opt-out. But I can tell you that the vast majority of calls are going to CPNI specialists that are dealing only with the opt-out equation.

COM. SPITZER: And bearing in mind that I think the company has an obligation given the procedural context of this, the company -- your company, not some other telecommunications company. challenged the FCC rule and through good lawyering was able to obtain its reversal and eliminate opt-in, so we live in an opt-out world.

The Central Hudson case, there was a statement by the Supreme Court that to eliminate falsehood and fallacy, the remedy is more speech, not enforced silence. In that regard, what is the company going to do to educate the public about the extent of CPNI and about their rights under federal law as interpreted by the company?

23 MR. SMITH: Well, certainly through the 24 notices that are being sent out that have been sent out in our bill insert, certainly through the media

customers have the right to consent. And given the 2 confusion and the difficulties -- and I elaborated

Page 68

Page 69

3 them and I'm not going to do it again -- vou've

4 articulated some of the difficulties in administering

5 an opt-out process, which seemed fundamentally in

conflict with the Act of Congress that said, it's the 7

customers that have the right to privacy. And an 8 opt-out puts the burden on the customer. And for all

9 the reasons that we've spent a lot of time discussing,

10 that is a difficult burden to impose. It's difficult 11 for the customer, and it's difficult for the company.

Is your company so insistent, so dogged in its determination to maintain an opt-out and put the burden on the customer that that is a decision no matter what kind of outcry is provoked in this state that the company is insistent on defending to the bitter throes?

MR. SMITH: I am in agreement with the determination, Mr. Commissioner, that was made by the Tenth Circuit. What I am determined to do is to avail this company of the same kind of marketing and selling practices that are generally available to customers

23 engaging in free enterprise in this country and

24 particularly in the telecommunications industry. I 25

think it's critical that we have that opportunity, and

Page 67

coverage and certainly through our statements of ciarification making very clear that we do not sell this information to third parties.

CHMN. MUNDELL: You're going to say "important privacy information" in your notice as opposed to "this doesn't impact your Qwest billing"?

MR. SMITH: There has been an implication, Mr. Chairman, that our design was such that we hoped that people would not read the notice. I can tell you as the head of this organization, that was absolutely not the case. There was not a requirement to put any indication by way of example on the outside of the envelopes where the bill insert was placed. We did

Again, our decisions here have not been to confuse and obfuscate. I understand that some confusion has been created. We are owning that confusion and seeking to clarify. But I want to make clear that we appreciate people's desire to understand their privacy rights and to exercise the choices that

21 they are given, and that was our intent. 22 COM. SPITZER: I want to be absolutely clear, 23 the concept of waiver is a voluntary, educated, and 24 informed. The language of the statute -- and Qwest 25 did not challenge the statute. And the statute said,

that was the opportunity that was supported on a consistent basis by the Tenth Circuit decision. And though I respect your difference in viewpoint, I for one am in agreement with the decision that was

rendered by the Tenth Circuit. COM. SPITZER: So then the company -- let me try it again. The company is implacable in its determination to maintain opt-out and will resist all

9 attempts to reverse that? 10

MR. SMITH: Implacable is your word, not mine. We were in agreement with the Tenth Circuit decision, and we do not intend to operate on an opt-in basis in the utilization of customer proprietary network information.

CHMN. MUNDELL: Let me try it a different way. The Tenth Circuit decision doesn't prevent a company, doesn't prevent Qwest from having an opt-in provision.

MR. SMITH: That is correct. And we intend not to have one.

21 CHMN. MUNDELL: We understand that. But if 22 you wanted to, you could. 23

MR. SMITH: Oh, absolutely.

24 CHMN. MUNDELL: Don't rely on that Tenth

25 Circuit to somehow imply --

Page 70 Page 72 ì MR. SMITH: And -regard to every other communications company in this CHMN. MUNDELL: Let me finish. One at a time 2 2 country. 3 3 because we have a court reporter here. COM. IRVIN: I wholeheartedly disagree with 4 4 That Tenth Circuit decision doesn't prevent that, but we won't get into that discussion. 5 the company from having an opt-in provision. 5 CHMN. MUNDELL: Please don't. 6 MR. SMITH: That is correct. 6 COM. IRVIN: Following Commissioner Spitzer, 7 CHMN. MUNDELL: And let me ask you this to 7 to your question on economics. I'm reading from an 8 follow up on what Commissioner Spitzer asked: You're 8 article from the Tucson Republic that Qwest is 9 not willing to stop the release of this information 9 ultimately reducing its work force by some 55,000 10 until the FCC completes their new rulemaking? 10 employees to meet reduced customer demand. MR. SMITH: We have gone far beyond the 11 11 CHMN. MUNDELL: Let's go ahead and -requirements of the FCC and have extended until March 12 12 MR. SMITH: We are not reducing our work 1.3 29th any utilization of this information within the 13 force by 55,000. I want to be very clear on that. 14 family of Qwest companies, and that is our stated 14 COM. IRVIN: I just read what the newspapers 15 policy. 15 CHMN. MUNDELL: So let's make it clear so 16 16 MR. SMITH: They are inaccurate. everybody understands. The FCC has started a new 17 CHMN. MUNDELL: Let's go ahead and take a 17 rulemaking process. They've closed the comment ten-minute recess. The court reporter probably needs 18 period. But having said that in the Court -- and 19 a break. I'll then go back and take public comment, 19 maybe this is better for your counsel. As I read that and then we'll have additional questions for Qwest 20 20 21 case, also, there's a possibility that a 21 counsel. So we'll stand in recess for ten minutes. constitutionally permissible opt-in provision would be 22 (Recess taken.) 22 23 CHMN. MUNDELL: Let's go ahead and go back on 23 appropriate and it would not violate the Constitution. That's what the FCC is look at right now, to determine the record in the Qwest dissemination of its 24 24 whether or not a flexible opt-in provision is customers' information to its affiliates and others. Page 71 Page 73 Mr. Smith, did you have a comment? Because I constitutional. Is that correct? 1 1 2 was going to call people from the public. 2 MR. SMITH: You should address that to MR. SMITH: Pardon me, Mr. Chairman. I 3 3 counsel 4 wanted to clarify an issue that Commissioner Spitzer 4 CHMN, MUNDELL: I'll ask your counsel that, 5 then, because, again, you can certainly do an opt-in 5 raised because I'm not sure that I was as clear as I provision if you wanted to, and you're not prevented 6 need to be. 6 7 7 by the Court decision from doing that. And I guess --If we handle billing on behalf of a long 8 distance company, that information that is contained 8 MR. SMITH: Any business in this country 9 in the billing records, calling patterns of that 9 could, Mr. Chairman, and I believe that they do not. COM. IRVIN: Let me follow up on that. I'm 10 particular customer, that is not our information. 10 going to make an assumption that the FCC is going to That is the information of the long distance carrier, 11 11 and we would not and could not utilize that 12 require an opt-in and it may or may not be challenged 12 information for our own marketing purposes. And I 13 legally. Are you going to give back that information? 13 wanted to make that clear on the record. 14 14 You've got that information and you're going to use CHMN. MUNDELL: Thank you, Mr. Smith. 15 15 it, aren't you. MR. SMITH: We will comply with any 16 Commissioner Irvin I think has something to 16 17 17 legitimate order of the Federal Communications say. 18 COM. IRVIN: Mr. Smith, I just have one other Commission or any court, Mr. Commissioner. 18 19 question, if I could, and then I do want to hear from 19 COM. IRVIN: See, I would think if you were a sensitive, caring company that I know you want to be, 20 the public and give them their opportunity. They've 20 you would hold this off until you heard from the FCC 21 21 been waiting patiently here. and this Commission until you continued this practice 22 You've given a Web address. And our Staff 23 of taking this information. And just as a note --23 went and pulled up that Web page, and there is 24 MR. SMITH: Which would put me, 24 nothing. This is just a blue copy of it. There is Mr. Commissioner, at a distinct disadvantage with 25 nothing on your home page that identifies where you

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

affiliates.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

can go to find out this policy in easy fashion. Can you explain why not?

MR. SMITH: I would have to go into the site myself and respond to that question, and I'm sure that we could before the close of this hearing so that I could provide you an appropriate and thorough answer.

COM. IRVIN: It just goes to my point that I made earlier, that the company makes it as difficult as possible -- what appears to me, to make it as difficult as possible to get information when we have issues like this. So hopefully, that's another little thing that I think can easily be corrected.

> MR. SMITH: I'd be happy to check that out. COM. IRVIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. CHMN. MUNDELL: Thank you, Commissioner

Spitzer.

I'll go ahead and start calling members of the public.

The first person I'll call is Eroca Daniel. Please come forward and obviously state your name for the record and tell us what you'd like us to know.

MS. DANIEL: Good morning, gentlemen. Eroca Daniel.

This is a private citizen interested in the 25 opt-out. It appears to me that the public privacy Page 74

of Qwest. I have the name of the company and the 2 gentleman who called. Again, it's not public

Page 76

Page 77

3 information, but I can give this to you at some time

4 if it's necessary. And they were calling from a

5 brokerage -- a health brokerage firm in Mesa, trying to sell me health insurance. And I said, I have a

7 private unlisted number. And I said, how did you get 8 this? And they said, we get this from Qwest.

So that brings me to another point. Since I do have a private unlisted number and I do pay extra for this privilege, why is it that my information is being shared? I believe that my extra cost for a private unlisted number, if it has been shared, needs to be reversed back to me with interest. And perhaps if it's shown that they have been doing that, that they be penalized.

CHMN, MUNDELL: Thank you, ma'am. Sounds like adding insult to injury. We'll get that specific information from you and follow up on that issue to ascertain how that information was disseminated.

21 MS. DANIEL: If this is correct, this meeting 22 is moot. It's already happening.

23 Thank you.

CHMN. MUNDELL: Thank you for your comments. 24 25

COM. IRVIN: I don't agree this meeting is

Page 75

barnyard door -- or the barn door, I should say, has been closed after the Qwest horse has taken off,

3 disseminating our information.

I called Qwest, this was several days ago, in order to opt-out of any sharing. What I found is that they could not confirm that they were going to -- that they would opt me out. I had to take the word of the nice people I was speaking to. I said, how do I do this? And the first employee said, call later in the afternoon, and they'll check it and you can confirm it. I said, okay. However, both employees -- I said, you know, I really don't understand about this. What have they been doing up to now? And both employees, whose names I have, but this is not a court of law, this is open hearing, so I figure hardworking people's names don't have to be disseminated. And they said, oh, they're sharing this now, but only among their own

When I got a phone in this town, I thought that I would get a dial tone, not a ringer at dinner time with a solicitor. So in that area, you have two people from Qwest, two Qwest employees, telling me they are already sharing this internally.

Two days ago, on the 14th, I get a call, and it's from a -- not an internal employee or affiliate

1 moot because certainly we need to put a stop to this

2 action. I think the Commission has made it clear to 3 Qwest our feelings; but, clearly, we have to do

4 whatever we can to protect the public, and my

5 colleagues have made that very, very clear. 6

MS. DANIEL: I certainly appreciate that. What I'm saying is if, indeed, they have been sharing this information and if, indeed, a private outside company has received this information from Qwest, we are trying to close the door when the horse has

already run. COM. IRVIN: That may be true, but we've got to close that door sooner or later.

MS. DANIEL: And catch the horse.

CHMN. MUNDELL: I think we've got to look into that because it contradicts what was stated earlier, because it doesn't sound like it was in the family of Owest companies.

COM. IRVIN: Remember, Commissioner, that's a big company.

CHMN. MUNDELL: Robert Lytle. And then after 22 this gentleman speaks, we will call out three names at 23 a time so if you can sort of get ready, get in the

24 on-deck circle. And we'll have one in the batter's

box and one in the batter's circle and one on the

Page 78 1 steps of the dugout. 1 2 Thank you, sir. 2 3 MR. LYTLE: Commissioners, I want to know 3 4 first or looking around the room, how many of you have 4 5 devices to monitor phone calls? No one has devices to 5 6 monitor phone calls? 7 The thing is that I get something in my mail 7 8 one day that says they're going to sell my private 8 9 information, and another time I get something in the 9 10 mail saying that they want to sell me something to 10 monitor my calls. So I'm beginning to believe that 11 11 12 the more people that have our information are going to 12 be making phone calls. Therefore, those that do not 13 13 14 have monitoring devices are going to have to buy them. 14 15 That's my short order. 15 16 CHMN. MUNDELL: Thank you, sir. 16 17 Any comments? 17 18 (No response.) 18 CHMN. MUNDELL: We appreciate your taking the 19 19 20 time to come down here today. 20 MR. LYTLE: Thank you. 21 21 22 22 COM. SPITZER: Two days in a row. 23 23 CHMN. MUNDELL: Shelly, call out three or 24 24 four names. 25 25 MS. KANE: I have a Master's degree from SECRETARY HOOD: Michael Wilkins, Mary Ellen

ACAA is concerned that this bill insert, which is essentially consumer education material, was distributed as marketing material, also, which has been brought up, that there is no Spanish version of this material. I read the material three times to get a clear understanding of it. If English is not my first language, I would be completely just -- I would not have informed consent as to what Qwest was asking. And, again, the Federal Communications Commission earlier sought to prohibit companies from using consumer data without their express permission. ACAA encourages the Arizona Corporation Commission to take the lead of the FCC and the original opt-in approach. Thank you very much. CHMN. MUNDELL: Thank you for your comments. COM. IRVIN: Mary, let me ask you a question. And you made a good point. I'm going to make the assumption you have some college education. MS. KANE: Yes. COM. IRVIN: Possibly even a degree? MS. KANE: Yes. COM. IRVIN: So a college-educated person with a degree has a difficult time understanding this.

Page 80

Page 81

Page 79

Kane, and Seth Franzman.

2 COM. IRVIN: You need to speak into the 3 microphone so they can hear you, Shelly.

SECRETARY HOOD: Michael Wilkins, Mary Ellen Kane, and Seth Franzman.

CHMN. MUNDELL: Any of those people here? Go ahead and come forward and welcome and

please state your name for the record. MS. KANE: Yes, good afternoon, gentlemen. My name is Mary Ellen Kane, and I'm here today to advocate on behalf of low income residents of Arizona.

I'm employed by the Arizona Community Action 12 13 Association.

14

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

15

17

18

19

20

21

ACAA has been monitoring Qwest's intent to share customer account information. Our organization is concerned deeply with regard to the impact this may have on Qwest's low income customers. ACAA is concerned that low income customers, as a population segment, are least likely to participate in an opt-out procedure. ACAA is concerned that the same customers will be unwitting victims of future target marketing.

22 The bill insert, as we've already mentioned 23 several times, directly states, we also sometimes disclose account information to third parties when it

is commercially reasonable to do so.

1 Thunderbird.

2 COM. IRVIN: So you have a Master's degree, 3 and you found this difficult.

4 MS. KANE: I pay the bills in our house. I 5 never saw the insert. I pulled out the bill and I 6 paid it and sent it on its way. I pulled it off the 7 Internet and read it several times. I had a general 8 overview, but I had to read it several times to make 9 sure I understood each aspect of it. And I feel I 10 have an advantage over another portion of the population of Arizona. 11

COM. IRVIN: And my point is, you are a well-educated citizen here. So it was difficult and confusing to you. Think of what it is to the other people.

MS. KANE: My point exactly.

CHMN. MUNDELL: You have an MBA from 17 18 Thunderbird?

19 MS. KANE: I have an MIM, yes.

20 COM. SPITZER: Then there's no hope for 21 lawyers, then.

22 COM. IRVIN: Well said, Commissioner.

23 CHMN. MUNDELL: Who's next?

24 COM. SPITZER: Mr. Franzman. 25

MR. FRANZMAN: Mr. Chairman, point of

21 (Pages 78 to 81)

12

13

14

15

16

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

21

22

23

24

25

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

7

8

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 82

clarification. I filed a slip for comments. I didn't indicate that I wanted to speak.

CHMN. MUNDELL: Thank you, sir. We want to give everybody that wants an opportunity to speak.

COM. IRVIN: We'll give those to the court reporter so those comments are noted in the record.

CHMN. MUNDELL: Thank you, Commissioner Irvin.

SECRETARY HOOD: Is Mr. Wilkins here? (No response.)

CHMN. MUNDELL: We'll have another three names.

SECRETARY HOOD: Phyllis Rowe, Jon Poston, and Julius Walters.

CHMN. MUNDELL: Come on down. State your name for the record, please.

MS. ROWE: I'm Phyllis Rowe. I'm president of the Arizona Consumers Council, and we're a non-profit statewide group that's been in Arizona for 35 years, and we're volunteers.

We've gotten lots of calls on our line about this issue. Consumers are irate. They're very upset.

23 They're upset about this negative check-off. And 24 so -- that they have to take action.

Now, always until about a year or so ago, we

Now, a telephone company that does this kind of thing, mails to millions of people, should certainly have had adequate lines available and adequately trained people to handle this kind of volume. And better yet, a voice response system,

which I believe they're going to do.

We've had particularly irate people who have had to pay a monthly fee for their number, which is not supposed to be on the directory, yet they're getting a lot of calls, and they don't like that. They're very upset. They don't see why they should have to pay a fee of like \$1.90 a month and still have people calling them because Qwest has given their number out.

One woman called to tell me that she wanted me to know that she was going to fire Qwest and she was going to go to somebody else. And I explained to her that there really wasn't very many other options that she had because Qwest was a virtual monopoly in our state, and she was very unhappy about that.

Now, we urge you to oppose the release of information by Qwest. We think that when they are doing this, they should have some kind of provision for Spanish-speaking and for other people to respond

5 because sometimes people who have difficulty getting

Page 83

did not have this negative check-off option. And I think that a lot of consumer groups are working on it because it was unfair in banking, it was unfair in insurance, and it's unfair in this issue, too.

When people tried to call and reach a number, they were unable to reach the telephone number. So I had people calling me who had called for three days, trying to get through on the line to Qwest.

Now, sometimes over the weekend they didn't have services. But even when I called, the phone rang 15 times --

CHMN. MUNDELL: Ma'am, is that recently? Because I had that same experience. I called a week ago and couldn't get through.

MS. ROWE: That was a week ago. Now they have speeded it up a bit. But the people didn't realize all these things that were hidden in small print and that they would have to respond to them. And so they're calling me, and they're particularly upset because when they finally reach someone, they try to sell them additional services, additional plans, or discourage them from this opting out program.

They're afraid of identity theft. They're really worried about privacy issues.

through when they call the line, they can't

communicate with the person that's there, particularly

3 Spanish-speaking people. And we'd like for you to

4 insist that they provide adequate voice response

5 system for callings and cease using this issue as a

6 business opportunity to sell more services.

Thank you.

CHMN. MUNDELL: Thank you.

9 Any questions?

10 (No response.)

11 CHMN, MUNDELL: Thank you.

MR. POSTON: Good morning, Commissioners.
Thank you for holding this hearing. My name is Jon
Poston. I'm the consumer coordinator for Arizonans
for Competition in Telephone Service.

This company has a long history of expecting customers to stand still and be milked. And I'm delighted to see the Commission appears to be on the verge of telling them at some point, sorry, no more moo for you. We'd like to see Qwest do something other than get it backwards for a change. The company should, as Commissioner Mundell suggested, ask customers' permission, not the reverse.

While I'm here, I want to dispel a myth that has been injected into this hearing by the company.

Page 84

18

20

21

22

23

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15 16

18

Page 86

This is not about a company that has a huge 2 competitive force out there ready to provide competitive service. While there are, in fact, a 3 4 hundred companies registered in the state with the 5 Commission or approximately that many prepared to 6 provide competitive service, there have been events that have intervened, including rates that have been 7 set, that have prevented that kind of competition. 8 9 The Commission is, of course, in the process of 10 addressing that question. That process is already 11 under way. 12 But I want to make it clear, what you're dealing with is not a company that has great 13 14 15

competitive pressures. There isn't another telephone company on every corner of the street. Owest is and continues to be a monopoly. The evidence that the Commission received at its most recent rate case indicates that the company has a penetration of about 95 to 97 percent of its customer base in the geographic region that it serves in the state of Arizona, and I doubt seriously that that's changed substantially.

I'd like to suggest to you that competition, in fact, would help, and that's one method that you can use to provide an answer to this in addition to

private. 2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3

4

5

8

10

11

12

13

4

15

16

17

18

19

22

Telephone has made it possible for anyone to call me. Qwest makes it easier for them to find my number, especially marketeers and salespeople, then offers me a service to block these calls. Yesterday I got a mailing from them in which they provided information that they would sell me a machine that would block these calls. They also in the very fine print on the bottom mention that there would be several different charges that went with this little machine, but they didn't tell me anything at all about how much these charges would be.

Page 88

Page 89

Qwest is my ISP for my computer. They switch my service anytime they feel like it. They recently forced me to change from NetScape to Explorer and promised faster service. It used to take me one to two minutes to get online. With their new faster service, it now takes me three to four minutes. Browsing is slower, too. This is Owest's fault as they provide the phone service.

As my ISP, they used to provide me with Scottsdale dial-up numbers. With the switchover, they now provide me with four dial-up numbers, one as far away as Gilbert. The default number is the slowest of the bunch, and I'm not very happy about that. Their

Page 87

these regulatory steps that can be taken by the Commission. And for those, we applaud you.

But were the competitive climate such that we had an alternative to Owest, then customers would have at least the possibility that another company would find this as the marketing opportunity and sell them a service that they could purchase in which the company would guarantee not to market their information. And I suggest to you that that is the broadest and easiest method of resolving the numerous problems that this Commission faces in regard to Qwest. That while this 12 is a step-by-step process, as the regulatory process necessarily is, the broader situation of injecting competition into the marketplace would, in fact, help resolve your many problems and many of them simultaneously.

17 Thank you.

CHMN. MUNDELL: Thank you.

19 MR. WALTERS: My name is Julius Walters. I 20

live in Fountain Hills. 21 I want to thank you folks for holding this meeting today. I think it's a very necessary meeting. 22 23 In regard to our invasion of privacy, it should be up to Qwest to ask me to permission to sell my data, not 24 for me to call them and ask them to keep my data

intent is to try to get me to order their DSL service when I get upset with their slow dial-up service. 2

When I try to call Qwest's business office and finally get through, I get their menu, which never has any subject I want to discuss and takes several minutes to go through. I then try to get to talk to a person and get put on hold. More than often than not, after holding for several minutes, I am dropped, and I am left holding a dead line. Automated service, as far as I'm concerned, should be banned. It's a waste of customers' time.

Owest does everything they possibly can to increase my costs for phone service, and I'm totally fed up with this. Qwest should be made to reimburse us for time that we waste trying to contact them for information, et cetera.

I thank you very much.

CHMN. MUNDELL: Thank you, sir, for your comments.

20 Call maybe three or four more, Shelly. 21

SECRETARY HOOD: John DeLasaux, Becky McCutchen, Dean Sellers.

23 CHMN. MUNDELL: Please state your name for 24 the record. Welcome. 25

MR. DELASAUX: Chairman Mundell and

23 (Pages 86 to 89)

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

2

3

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

19

20

21

22

23

24

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

24

25

1

3

4

5

6

7

0

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 90

Commissioners, my name is John DeLasaux. I'm a local 2 business person and also I have about 11 years behind 3 me in dealing with phone services all over the world, 4 dialing long distance into companies, and that's what 5 Lused to do. Not telemarketing. Technical support-type thing.

I really need to preface my comments by saying that Qwest has shot itself in the kneecap with its phone system. Its internal phone system is probably the worst phone system ever invented in my experience. That's just for their own information.

I'm not going to take a lot of time talking about dialing in and having the problem of getting my privacy except to say that I finally gave up and went to the Web page. When I went to the Web page, in my experience, in the last 12 years on the Internet, I have never entered a Web page and asked for something without getting a confirmation. It's business practice on the Internet. So when I opted in to the Web page and -- to opt-out, I expected to get an e-mail. And I didn't get it.

I got concerned, so I called the business office to verify that it actually happened. And the person that I got could not explain to me how privacy works at all. And finally, she said, well, but I've

problem with that is that the cat is already out of the bag because our privacy will have already been used. Once the cat's out, you can't put it back in.

Page 92

Page 93

There's a lot of misunderstanding about this. And I'm really concerned that Owest needs to get their attitude tuned up a bit to let them understand that we aren't all a bunch of dummies out there. They don't own our private information. My private information is stuff I own. And if they want to use it, they better ask me. Bottom line.

. Thank you.

12 CHMN. MUNDELL: Thank you, sir. 13 COM. SPITZER: Thank you very much, sir. And 14 I just think, very briefly, two points. Your 15 discussion about the use of the Internet -- at year 16 end, I paid a bunch of bills and made a bunch of charitable contributions over the Internet, bar dues, 17 donation to my alma mater --18

19 CHMN, MUNDELL: Explain what bar dues mean, 20 Commissioner Spitzer.

COM. SPITZER: The amount that you pay for 21 22 the privilege of practicing law in the state of 23 Arizona.

CHMN, MUNDELL: I just want to make sure everybody understands what you mean by that.

Page 91

taken your name off the list. Whatever that means.

I didn't trust her, so I called back to get another person in the business office. When I asked him what had happened, check my account, please, he said, there's no code put into your account. Then he explained to me that there are actually four codes. I have never heard an explanation anywhere about the fact that there are four different privacy codes that you can have in your account. And when he explained to me what the codes were, he said, and by the way, the lady that put the last code into your account put in the wrong code. So, he said, I'll fix that for you. And he fixed it. And actually he ended up putting two different privacy codes into my account.

You know, I don't know how to describe why it is that Owest can't understand that they're their own worst enemy. But when I read this yellow piece of paper that's a legal notice that Qwest put out, it is couched in the most generalized terms that have no meaning whatsoever. And the idea of commercially reasonable says that that means that Owest gets to decide what's commercially reasonable.

The bottom line is that they don't really get to decide because somebody's going to sue, and the courts are going to decide what was reasonable. The

COM. SPITZER: Everything entailed a confirmation. Even for a \$50 contribution to an obscure organization that may not have the wherewithal.

MR. DELASAUX: That's standard business practice.

COM, SPITZER: It's all done by e-mail. And I think what we had here was the unfortunate precedent was set with Gramm-Leach-Bliley, which was financial organizations were required under federal law to send out a notice. Whole forests were cut down to produce these notices that all ended up in the trash can. There was virtually no interest by consumers in opting

And, unfortunately, it was felt that -- the marketing folks in Owest felt that was the precedent and that the people wouldn't be interested. And I think it was a surprise that people were interested in privacy rights attendant to telecommunications. MR. DELASAUX: People can't be interested in

something they don't know about. This should have been publicized beforehand that says you're going to get a notice. Putting the notice in is not good practice. Maybe you buy a half page ad in the paper and say, look what's coming. I don't know.

24 (Pages 90 to 93)

Page 94

CHMN. MUNDELL: That's why I said earlier it needs to be readable and understandable so people can make an informed consent if they want the way the opt-out provision is currently in existence.

Please state your name.

MS. McCUTCHEN: I'm Becky McCutchen. I'm from the East Valley.

Thank you to having this hearing. I'm a Qwest customer. Used to be U S WEST. When I first signed up for my account, I told them my account was not for solicitation. I do spend extra to have an unlisted number. I do not want my information given out. I don't want it sold. I don't want it given to anybody else that will sell it or give it out.

Thank you.

CHMN. MUNDELL: Thank you, ma'am. That was short and to the point.

MR. SELLERS: My name is Dean Sellers. I also have been a customer of Qwest for years, both professionally and personally.

The highest compliment that I could give them as far as the services rendered to me is pathetic. I think that what we've experienced here today on the part of Mr. Smith as the personal representative of Qwest is a futile expedition -- or expedition of a

too, because I think the only concern he really truly
has here today, if you're able to look inside his mind
and his heart, is whether he has a job tomorrow or
not.

The people of Arizona are interested, again, if I can reaffirm, a most precious right that we have in this country, and that's our privacy. They don't have a right to trample on one of our most precious rights.

Now, he bragged up here that they have 290 operators that they just hired. Well, I'm not too good of a mathematician, but if I put a ratio of 290 operators with 3 million hostages that they're holding out there, that's not a very good percentage for our benefit.

Basically what Mr. Smith also did is he made a statement very plain to the people of Arizona when you were asking him as pertaining to our position as far as the Tenth Circuit Court. And he was very explicit to state that they are going to stick with them. And what I'd like to say is, basically, they're hiding behind the skirts of the Tenth Circuit Court.

The consumers of Arizona are experiencing

from Qwest and Mr. Smith a sneak attack and a trampling, again, of the most precious right, which is

Page 95

camouflage double talk is basically what we've seen here today. The comments, dancing around the bush, around the issues, not answering questions directly shows the integrity of the company. And this is what they expect us to believe when he tells us that he really cares about the customers here in Arizona.

I'd just like to ask three questions and make a couple -- three points:

First of all, as was presented very eloquently by our Attorney General, why should we put our trust, the people of Arizona, in the hands of a company that's already under investigation for consumer fraud? That's my first question that every Arizonan needs to ask themself.

Second of all, why should the burden be placed on our back to have to protect what is one of our most precious rights, and that's our privacy. I think it's an insult to injury that they would even come forth with this type of lame excuse for their own profiteering.

The people in this country are tired of smooth-talking half-truths being presented by large corporations. The only thing they're concerned about is the bottom line of their smoke-filled boardrooms.

If I was Mr. Smith, I'd be pretty concerned,

1 the privacy.

I think he needs to read the lips of the people here today because I think we speak for the vast majority of the people of Arizona. And that is, opt-in is the only option that we're going to accept. We're not going to accept anything else, and we're drawing a line in the sand.

You are our representatives. You have our trust. And we have a great deal of trust in the three of you. And I appreciate the comments that you've made today because they've been very close to the heart of what I would consider to be the heartbeat of the people of the state of Arizona.

I again would just say that there is only one thing that we will accept, and that's the opt-in provision to where it is their responsibility to come to us at their expense and at our convenience and ask us for permission. And if we don't give it in writing, they don't get anything. It's opt-in and opt-in only.

CHMN. MUNDELL: Thank you, Mr. Sellers. COM. IRVIN: Mr. Sellers, just real quick, for math purposes, with your example of 3 million and 290, it comes to each customer will handle -- I'm sorry, one million three hundred forty-four-plus

Page 97

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Page 98

thousand people.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

CHMN. MUNDELL: Shelly, do you want to call

SECRETARY HOOD: Albert Sterman, Laurie Shea, Carolyn Cortez.

CHMN. MUNDELL: Did you hear her, those names that she just called?

Welcome.

MR. STERMAN: Good morning. No, good afternoon. My name is Al Sterman, S-t-e-r-m-a-n, vice president of the Arizona Consumers Council and chairman of the Utility Committee of that council.

I can only applaud, Commissioner Mundell, Commissioner Irvin, and Commissioner Spitzer, in your comments at the beginning of this meeting and at the pointed questions that you asked Qwest.

One thing I'm surprised at, why aren't there operators here today at this meeting taking names of people who want to opt-out? It's a meeting that talks about that. Why couldn't Qwest have at least one person so those of us who for one reason or other have not already opted out have that opportunity to do so today?

This action of Owest attacks the fundamental rights of citizens of the state. Telecommunications

won't say -- they say they don't sell, but they lease, they give our most private information to people who probably should not have it.

Page 100

Page 101

The information that Qwest is and can gather is the person's most private history: health, what he reads, political affiliations, social contracts, social contacts, business interests. Whatever it is that is private that should be held in the most private thoughts. What they're selling is my thoughts or giving away my thoughts. And that should not be allowed.

Why should this company be allowed to use or sell this most private information and, in fact, a person's most intimate thoughts. Qwest, according to the Tenth Circuit, may have the legal right to do something. But that does not mean that they have or should have ethically or moral right to trade this information.

I may be moving back and forth for just a couple of minutes.

Sharing of information even within their companies, especially in the competitive market, gives Owest a distinct competitive advantage. They're not going to sell it to any other competitor, but they're using it within their family of competitive companies

Page 99

to market to their customers of Qwest as a local

by itself intrudes. And it's an intrusive device because the telephone is in your home. The computer is in your home. Whatever telecommunications you have is in your home. It's always on. And then the phone rings, and it can ring anytime of the day or night, including at 4:00 in the morning.

COM. SPITZER: It's not on in the Spitzer house all the time.

MR. STERMAN: But the telephone is, at least. So it's intrusive. Somebody calls, you're intruding on what we are doing, whether it's eating or sleeping or watching TV or writing a proposal or whatever it is we do.

But we expect that when we lease a line from Qwest, and that's what we're doing, we're leasing a line, we're buying a telephone, leasing a line, and we expect to have what we consider privacy, at least to the extent that it can be given, is to be adhered to.

But that does not give this corporation or any corporation from going to intrusiveness to invasion of privacy. That privacy has been mentioned before by a number of people as a fundamental right.

This company, along with organizations it 24 deals with, are literally invading our homes with their telemarketing, with their giving, leasing -- 1 monopoly utility. To the bill insert asking people to opt-out

4 if they wanted to. I would think that 4 percent on a bill insert is a marvelous response. I remember when we went to Caller ID and we sat for weeks going over the information on the brochure that Qwest would send out offering Caller ID and asking people to either opt-in or opt-out of Caller ID and giving people the 10 opportunity of saying, I don't want my name published in Caller ID. I want that private. We spent weeks 11 with Qwest -- U S WEST at the time -- with the 12 Attorney General, with Staff, with interested parties, 13 14 and came up with a brochure and a deadline. 15

And we said to Qwest, you will send that out by U.S. Mail and a return envelope or return postcard so that people get it, it's first class. They were supposed to send it first class. They sent it bulk. But they were supposed to send it first class at the time. At least you had the opportunity to open it up, read the letter, and then make your decision in the privacy of your own home. This does not give us that.

And I think if Qwest is going to use an opt-out -- and I don't agree with an opt-out. I agree only with an opt-in. And in a sense, I don't think

26 (Pages 98 to 101)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

4

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

1

2

18

19

20

Page 102

they should give that information out to anyone. It's private, my proprietary information, and I should be able to determine who it goes to.

If Qwest gives this information to what they call their outside marketers, what assurance do I have that my information would not be taken by these outside marketers and used to my detriment, whatever that detriment is. What assurance do we have that that information remains within the company and only within -- and given back wholly without being used again to the company.

I was concerned about a couple of other things:

One, I don't understand these codes that were brought up. If there was more than one code to enter into their computers to protect my privacy and they only put in one code, what about the three other codes? Who gets those if this is correct? And I can only go by what the gentleman before me talked about.

20 And the other is -- and I think it was 21 mentioned if a company, one of the family of 22 companies, is sold off, does that private information 23 go to that company? And if it does, why? Or if the 24 company goes into bankruptcy, does that information get sold off as a part of the bankruptcy because it

deceiving because I took it as an advertisement to 2 sell something. 3

And also, I think it should have been put out in Spanish or any other language that people speak in the United States because there are a lot of people that do not speak English.

Page 104

Page 105

Another thing that I'm concerned about is how much is it going to cost us? If this does pass and you get to give our information out, how much is it going to cost us to keep you from doing that? Are we going to have another charge as we do in the Caller ID? I purchase Caller ID to know who's calling us, and you guys have conveniently put on names like unidentified caller, unwanted caller, blocked calls and so on and so on. So I'm paying for a service that if one of my relatives from out of state calls me, it comes across possibly as out of area the same as a telemarketer or somebody that doesn't want me to know their name for God knows what reason. And I'm getting tired of paying for things through the phone company that I'm not really getting the proper service.

And, again, I don't want my personal information given out.

23 24 Thank you all.

COM. SPITZER: Thank you.

Page 103

becomes worth some money to somebody else who's going to buy the company or buy the mailing lists?

I thank you very much for your time and congratulate you on holding this meeting.

CHMN. MUNDELL: Thank you for your comments. You've raised a couple additional questions that need to be answered at some point.

Shelly.

SECRETARY HOOD: Is Laurie Shea here?

10 (No response.)

11 CHMN. MUNDELL: Laurie Shea.

12 (No response.)

13 SECRETARY HOOD: Carolyn Cortez.

14 CHMN. MUNDELL: Please state your name for 15 the record and welcome.

16 MS. CORTEZ: This is the first time I've ever 17

spoke in public, so I'm nervous.

18 CHMN. MUNDELL: We won't be too hard on you. 19 MS. CORTEZ: My name is Carolyn Cortez.

20 And first off, I'd like to say, I don't want

21 my personal information put out anywhere. I think if

22 you've got a good idea that you want us to know about,

23 you could continue putting it in our billing as you

24 have done in the past. And I did find that "the

25 following information does not impact your bill" very CHMN. MUNDELL: Thank you, ma'am.

SECRETARY HOOD: Chuck Jones, Donna Neill,

3 Cristina Santiago.

4 MR. JONES: My name is Chuck Jones. I'm a 5 central Phoenix resident.

6 I have a grandmother who's in an assisted care home. She's 97 years old. And when she was

first moved in there, she was not going to have a phone. She's got five children who love her very

much. And I said, that's not right. And I said, I 10 will pay for the phone. And the bill comes to me. 11

She has a phone for the sole reason that her children 12

in Colorado and California and Arizona can call her 13

and say, "Mom, I love you." She is not interested in 14

buying anything. She's not interested in getting 15 16

interrupted by having to buy anything. 17

We've lost sight of the fact that Qwest for hundreds of thousands of people in this state is a monopoly. It is the only choice going to get local coverage for telephone service.

21 Qwest wants to say, well, we should be doing 22 this the opt-out because that's what everybody else 23 does. It's a childish argument. And I bet there's

24 not a single adult with children in this room who has 25

looked at their child at one time or another and said,

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

1

2 3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

2

3

4

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

24

25

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 106

No, you're not going to do what everybody else does 2 because you're not everybody else. And besides that, 3 it's wrong. 4

That's what we've lost the scope of. This is just something that's wrong. They say it's legal because of this Court of Appeals ruling. There are lots of things in this country that are legal that are neither right nor fair to your fellowman. The Black people in this country were granted the right to vote by the Constitution, and it was four generations before enough elected officials with enough integrity got together to say, hey, you've been denying these people their voting rights. This is wrong. Four generations to go back to doing what's right.

Qwest wants to say that they're just emulating companies like banks and insurance companies and credit card companies. I can call those companies 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and get help. I cannot call Qwest 24 hours, seven days a week. They eliminated that service a couple years ago.

21 Mr. Smith -- I noticed very carefully. 22 Everything he said today was in the present tense. 23 That leaves lots of openness for the future. And I 24 think we should be very scared what any corporation 25 does because of one name, and that would be Enron.

your name in the phone directory, there's a one-time set-up for that, and you pay a monthly charge in perpetuity. People buy Caller ID to prevent being harassed.

Page 108

Page 109

5 For every single service that you need -- and 6 you only got the phone in the first place because of 7 what you want to use the phone for. And even if you 8 have a no solicitation dot in the phone book, I 9 suspect Owest will probably still call you on their 10 own under their plans to try to sell you extra services that you neither need nor want. 11

I work in a company that does shipping. I have seen plenty of people sending back Qwest cellular phones because they didn't understand all the terms in the first place that were required. And one of my co-workers, in fact, has a \$1,200 billing statement right now because he didn't cancel the service quick enough and didn't understand all of the terms.

19 They say they have no plan to share this 20 information now. They won't state that they -- either now or in the future. They are not saying that. They are very careful in what they say. And plans change, and that's what concerns I think most of us in this room

I am extremely disappointed in Qwest's

Page 107

He says he has honor and respect for his customers. If Qwest had honor and respect for their customers, there would not be a hearing here today. None of us would be here. They would have backed out of this, and they would have seen that what the public wants is an opt-in system and not an opt-out system.

They talk about the information will not be sold. Once again, it's very carefully worded. Lots of companies trade information in various ways in this date and time.

And the bankruptcy issue was another good one. We don't know what accountants Qwest has at this time or what's going to go on. The Wall Street Journal reporter on the PBS news hour last night said that there were lots of other Enrons just waiting to happen, and we don't know who or when.

If you don't want to be harassed, there is 18 just a litany of extra fees you have to pay the phone 19 company. My grandmother's phone, we had to pay extra for nonlisted service. There's a one-time set-up fee 20 21 for this. And I'm not sure what the difference is 22 between nonpublished and nonlisted. One can be gotten 23 out of directory assistant. But for both of them, 24 there's a one-time set-up fee, but you pay a monthly

charge in perpetuity. If you want a black spot by

attitude toward this Commission. Chairman Mundell asked a very straightforward question about the 3 publicity pamphlet that went out. Was it printed in Spanish. Several people have gotten up here and said 5 that it should be. We don't know if it went out in

Spanish or not because Mr. Smith did not even give the 6 courtesy of a yes, no, or I don't know answer to the

8 Commission Chairman. If Owest has this little respect 9 for the Commission of the State of Arizona, they

certainly don't have any for the rest of us that are 10 customers, and they should be ashamed of themselves. 11 CHMN. MUNDELL: Thank you, sir. 12

MS. NEILL: Mr. Chairman and Commission members, I'm Donna Neill, and I'm the chairperson of Westwood Community, the most populated square mile in Phoenix, and I'm also the director of Nailem, and we're about 35,000 strong.

You know, it was real interesting when the Attorney General was here. She called you colorful. I can tell you as community members, we call you appalling. On our Web site, we sent out a thing and asked folks to give us their opinions, and we received hundreds of e-mails, and not one comment came that said, we trust them, we respect them, we're glad they're in our state. They all came back with

28 (Pages 106 to 109)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

6

7

8 9

10

11

22

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

22

23

24

2

3

4

10

11

12

16

Page 110

comments of things that had happened.

I can also tell you that you have a thing on your phone that you have to have a security name when you call to get any information. I went through ten operators the other day, and not one operator asked me for my security code. Not one. I mean, that was something that I had to do for protection, and you did not protect me. So I can certainly know that if you didn't do it on that case, it isn't going to happen again.

You can do what you can do because you can. And as a director of Nailem, I'm going to make a commitment not only to the Commission but to the state of Arizona and to you that anytime you come before this Commission, anytime that you're here and you're wanting change or ability to do something different, I will be standing here in front of you.

When Mr. Smith would not even compromise or listen or talk about -- send a straight signal to everyone that's in this room that you're going to do what you want to do and how you can do it. But this is going to be your stopguard right here.

23 And we thank you for being here. We thank you for doing this. And we know that it's going to 24 stand on the line, and it's not going to happen.

Page 112

fraud problem. I know that we're not here for this, but as far as the opt-in/opt-out, yes, the Hispanic

3 community are not aware. I was educated here in the 4

United States. I also did go to college. And I still 5

couldn't understand it even.

CHMN, MUNDELL: Welcome to the club.

COM, IRVIN: You're not alone.

MS. SANTIAGO: To me, this is the most blatant form of monopoly. I have thought, where can I go besides cellular system to get service. Like has been mentioned before, you call in because you have a problem. You have to wait minutes, minutes, and minutes. When you finally get someone, they do cut you off half of the time. You ask for supervisors. It's like forever to try and get someone who's a supervisor. They might say, okay, we take care of the

18 problem. It's not been taken care of. 19 I'm for opt-in. This opt-out, why should we 20 have to go through opt-out. I mean, this is our right. It's our privacy. Why should you have this 21

problem. But a month later, you've got the same

Like one of the people here mentioned before, we are unwilling victims. The Hispanic community and other organizations, other people that do not speak

opportunity to give out the phone numbers to whomever.

Page 111

Thank you.

CHMN. MUNDELL: Shelly.

Hold on for a second, ma'am.

SECRETARY HOOD: Dianne Woods, Diane Bacon.

5 CHMN. MUNDELL: Thank you, ma'am. Welcome.

MS. SANTIAGO: Thank you for the opportunity of speaking. My name is Cristina Santiago of Hispanic Community Alliance. I am the director.

And we have mentioned before about the Hispanic community not getting information. This has been bothering me for over a year now. I get a lot of

12 complaints about Qwest, which at that time was U S 13 WEST before. And the Hispanic community have their

14 hands tied, completely tied. They do not get any

15 information. When they call in to get the service,

they have to go through hours -- probably hours of 16

waiting. They get sold out on the cellular phones. 17

18 This is the main thing, they do not get explained as

19 to the cost, all kinds of costs that there are, and so

20

21 complain.

> I thought I was smart enough not to be a victim of Qwest; but, unfortunately, twice within the

23 24 last six months, I've been a victim of Owest.

25 I want to talk to Janet Napolitano about the

they get a real large bill. They come to me to 20

21

SECRETARY HOOD: Jap Harrison and Leslee Olson and Cesar Marin.

22

24 to thank the Commission for holding this meeting today

Page 113

English are the unwilling victims.

And as far as the cellular system, this is -to me, it's rip off. And I would say to Qwest, you

cannot hide the sun with your fingertip. It's coming

5 out to light, the problem. And I'm really, really 6 very pleased that the Commission has finally done

7 something about this or is doing something about this. 8

And I know I'm going to make sure that as many

Hispanics in the area are informed of the problem and to call in and to inundate Qwest with complaints.

Thank you for listening.

COM. SPITZER: Thank you very much.

13 CHMN. MUNDELL: Thank you, ma'am. 14

COM. IRVIN: Thank you.

15 SECRETARY HOOD: Dianne Woods.

(No response.) SECRETARY HOOD: Diane Bacon.

17 MS. BACON: I'm available if you have any 18 19 questions.

CHMN. MUNDELL: Okay.

23 MR. HARRISON: I'm Jap Harrison, and I want

against Owest.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

11

Page 114

And I just have a few questions I want to ask 2 them. The brochure you sent out, how come it couldn't 3 have been the other way? If somebody want to join 4 your family, call in. Not somebody that want to be 5 out of your family have to call in. Because here, there's a whole lots of people that have had a 7 contract with you people for years. And they get 8 their phone bill, and they think they know just to 9 write out a check and send it in, and they don't see 10 this. And so this was tossed. And in a couple of 11 months, they're going to be getting a bill where they've got to pay for this. And they don't want the 12 13

And another thing, I want to know about your family. See, you talking about your family. This is going to be put in your family. And I know my family consists of cousins, uncles, everything. And if I tell one something, it goes on down to his family way out someplace else.

COM. SPITZER: There's an old saying: You can pick your friends, but you can't pick your family.

MR. HARRISON: There you go. And so it's going to tell it within his family, and his family's going to pass it on within his own.

And here's the piece of paper. If you don't

privacy information. And so Qwest is doing its part

by sending out this notice. Everyone that is a

3 customer gets a bill, so the notices are in there.

And many businesses have this process of giving out 5 phone numbers.

6 But yes, Qwest is the only option for phone 7 service for many people. And so it also is worth 8 saying that the online option of letting people know 9 that they do not want -- letting Qwest know that they 10 do not want the information given out is very quick. 11 And so if they would go that route, it would be a lot 12 more helpful I think to people versus being on the phone. But they've done their job, also, by updating 13 14 and having more people available to answer the phone for people that want to not give out your private 15

So I think they've also extended their deadline and they've done a good job of trying to be hospitable after the situation that has happened the past couple weeks.

CHMN. MUNDELL: You're a brave soul. You understand the concern about the notice. At least I believe and I think my fellow commissioners believe the notice could have been stated differently so that people could make an informed consent about opting out

Page 115

Page 117

Page 116

want to receive the junk mail, call these telephone 2 numbers. And here it says down here about the telephone. It says after a few months, your calls will be reduced. It don't say stopped. It says, 5 after a few months, they will be reduced. And I know 6 right now today, there's going to be five telemarketing phones on my phone when I get to the 8 house now, and they're fixed where you can't call them 9 back. And there's three, two of them come in about 10 dinner time.

The only thing that I just got a comment to 12 make about -- years ago, there used to be a postcard 13 in Arizona. They had two buzzards out on the fence. And they hadn't had nothing to eat. And they said, 15 Ain't nothing died, so I'm going to kill something. And it looks like you want to kill something here 16 today.

17 18 COM. IRVIN: I can't beat that. I thought 19 the rabbits was a good analogy. That's even better. 20 CHMN. MUNDELL: I asked about the family, but 21 I couldn't articulate it like he did.

22 Welcome.

23 MS. OLSON: My name is Leslee Olson. 24 I think the media has blown this out of

25 proportion. The Court said that Owest could have this

of their program. So that's one of the concerns that we have obviously. And so we appreciate you coming down and stating your opinion.

Thank you.

information.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

22

COM. SPITZER: Mr. Chairman, notice, I think it was in our Prescott bill had 928. And I don't know if it had the same in Phoenix. The new 928 area code. And so I held it up and said, Mr. Chairman, Jackie, to call your mother, we've got to dial 928 now, and tossed it, without knowing that there was anything else.

COM. IRVIN: Can I call Ms. Olson back to the podium, please. I have a question for her.

14 CHMN. MUNDELL: Certainly. I said she was a brave soul. 15

COM. IRVIN: Ms. Olson, you stated that you work for The Aaron Company?

MS. OLSON: Yes.

19 COM. IRVIN: Is that the same Aaron Company 20 that does lobbying work for the phone company? 21

MS. OLSON: Sir.

COM. IRVIN: Thank you.

23 MR. MARIN: My name is Cesar Marin. I'm kind 24 of nervous.

25 I'm an ex-employee of Qwest Communications.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

25

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

2

3

4

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

19

20

21

22

23

24

Page 118

I was a sales consultant for them. I was fired on Christmas Eve, which wasn't too nice, along with a few other people.

But what my whole opinion on this is a lot of people have downed Qwest on a lot of their practices and a lot of their things. And I think they're misunderstood.

And like the whole cell phone thing. As a sales consultant, I would explain it to customers, and I would give them my personal number. And they would call me back and say, you never told me this. And I did tell the customer that. It's just customers have selective hearing. It's just a lot of times Qwest gets the bad wrap for a lot of things that they don't do.

16 But as far as the opt-out, there's a lot of things that attention doesn't get put to. For 17 18 example, this whole opt-out thing. I did receive the training on it before I left Qwest. And the 19 20 understanding that I got from the opt-out was that when a customer calls in and asks me as a sales 21 22 consultant, I need to transfer my service, I need to 23 do something to my account, then I have to ask the 24 customer permission to use their account information minutes were racked up on it. And then she comes home and finds it, calls back Qwest, yelling and screaming.

And I took the whole situation to a supervisor. Well, they should have read the contract. It's not our fault. They're still responsible for \$200 cancellation, they're responsible for monthly service, and they're responsible for a \$600 unit that was sent to them. So this customer ended up with over a thousand dollar cell phone bill that Qwest was making her pay. And she was crying on the phone.

And I took it to a supervisor, and the supervisor refused to remove anything. And gave a credit card payment over the phone for it. Because the Hispanic people do not like to owe people. And for us, it's a detriment to have bad credit or not to pay somebody. So she was forced into paying this money when she should have not paid it.

And as a Owest employee myself, if a customer calls me, they're calling that number, I get on the line as a sales consultant. And they're asking me, hey, I want to opt-out, I'll tell them, yeah, yeah, yeah, we'll go ahead and do it. But I won't put it on their account because it won't help me because we're commissioned sales. And if we don't make our sale, we get fired.

Page 119

have the opt-out thing or they don't have the permission to do that, then they can't actually sell anything or offer anything to the customers. So I understand it on that end.

to actually offer them services. So if they don't

But on the end that I don't understand and I don't agree with is that when they have the access to all of their information, all of these telemarketers get it, and a lot of these telemarketing companies work for Qwest and sell products for Qwest.

The biggest one that I have problems with is the PCS. Qwest will have a telemarketing company that they hire. The customer didn't call in to opt-out, so they give all of the customer's information.

14 And this is just an example. Janet Rivera was her name. I still remember her name. She's a 1.5 Hispanic woman. She was one of the customers that I 16 had assisted. And she had a problem because she only 17 speaks English. She has all these telemarketing 18 19 firms -- only speaks Spanish. And she has all these

20 telemarketing firms calling in English. One of these telemarketers called her and offered her a cell phone. 21

22 Well, of course, she didn't understand anything, so 23 she really wasn't able to speak to this person. This

24 person went ahead and sent her the cell phone anyway.

25 So her kids got it, they started playing with it,

COM, IRVIN: Run that by me again. You said 2 that if somebody called in, you don't put it down 3 because you're commissioned sales?

MR. MARIN: I'm a commissioned salesman. It's not going to make me money. And supervisors listen in on many calls when we do this, and they do nothing about it.

And I asked the supervisor on one phone call -- this was very interesting. A customer had called in reference to installing service, and this girl was trying to sell Custom Choice, which is our premier package. And she said, your service is going to be 12 \$32.95 a month. It's going to be this, this, this, and this, and just gave her a choice to have Linebacker or not. They never disclosed the IFR, 16 which is the disclosure by the Corporation Commission. 17 They did not disclose a lot of the information. They 18 didn't disclose any of the taxes. And they just told them what they were going to get, which was the most expensive package that they had.

And a supervisor was listening in on the phone call, and I asked her, is that right? And she said, well, the customer agreed to it, and it's perfectly fine. There's nothing wrong with it. It's called assuming the sale.

Page 121

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

5

6

13

14

15

17

18

19

It's not called assuming the sale. It's called slamming. And it's something that Qwest is having a hugh turnover -- a high turnover rate on their sales people because they're constantly being fired because they don't make their numbers because we're forced to slam.

So it's an ethics thing. I couldn't sleep at night anymore, so that's why -- I was actually thinking of resigning before they were going to --10 they were going to fire me -- before I found out that 11 they were going to fire me because of my numbers 12 because I felt bad about doing the things that I was doing, and I refused to do it any further. And so my 13 14 numbers started going down. It's something that all Qwest employees -- all consultants do. The 15 supervisors don't actually tell us, hey, do this, but 17 they insinuate. And when they hear on the calls, they don't stop it.

18 19 COM. IRVIN: So what I'm hearing you say, 20 Mr. Marin, is in your experience -- let me ask this 21 question: You are no longer employed by the company?

MR. MARIN: No, I'm not. 22

23 COM. IRVIN: When did you leave the company?

24 MR. MARIN: January 3rd. 25 COM. IRVIN: Of this year? Page 122 1 MR. MARIN: I have no idea.

> 2 COM. IRVIN: So you were never told you could 3 or could not call the Commission. What were you told 4 when you were educated into the ACC rules when you 5 knew that you were not disclosing appropriate information that was required by this Commission under 6 7 its regulatory authority?

Page 124

Page 125

8 MR. MARIN: They put us through a three-month 9 training. And during that training -- it's an outside company that they hired to train us. And when we're

trained, they train us per all the rules, they say. 11 12 You have to give the 1FR disclosure. You have to let

13 the customer know what this is, what that is. And

14 then after you're done with this training, you're 15 actually on the sales floor, and you're speaking with

16 customers. And everything changes because now you're being trained by your supervisors on how to sell. And 17

18 they start telling you, oh, it doesn't matter when you 19 give the disclosure. You can give it at the end of

20 the call.

21 COM. IRVIN: I want to keep to your personal 22 experience. I don't want to go on to hearsay or

23 anything else. Generalizing. 24

MR. MARIN: That's my personal experience. 25 I'm speaking from what I was taught, from what I was

Page 123

1

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MARIN: Yes. They gave me a couple 1 2 weeks.

3 COM. IRVIN: So you worked up fairly recently. 4

How long were you employed with the company?

MR. MARIN: For a year.

7 COM. IRVIN: So you worked from January to 8 January?

9 MR. MARIN: January 15th, 2001, was my hire 10 date, and I was let go on the 3rd. 11

COM. IRVIN: And it's your experience that 12 this is the practice and custom of Qwest employees?

MR. MARIN: Yes. If you were to get a phone right now and have everybody listen and have somebody in here that has an account call in and order cell phone service, they would not give that person all the disclosures because then they would lose a sale. And what my job as a salesman is to try to get the

customer to buy the product no matter what it takes. 20 And that's the whole problem with the company. 21

COM. IRVIN: It seems to me -- now, is 22 there -- were you threatened? Was there a reprisal 23 that if you came to the Corporation Commission and stated, I'm a Qwest employee and this is a practice, 25 they're violating ACC rules --

told from my supervisors, and from what I was forced

to do in the company. And I don't feel very good 2 3 about myself right now because there's a lot of people

4 that really didn't make very good wages and was barely

5 getting by with their families and was barely able to 6 support their families, and I convinced them per se to

7 get Custom Choice when they didn't need to spend that 8 money and should have spent it on diapers for their

9 child. 10

COM. SPITZER: Mr. Chairman.

Sir, I want to make two points. You shouldn't feel too hard for yourself. I want to make plain -- and I think I speak for my colleagues.

No. 1, this Commission is not attacking the employees of Qwest. We know that there are many very, very good employees. And over the course of my living in Arizona for 20 years, I've had problems with the phone company. No question about it. But a lot of the folks, the linemen, the customer service reps, I've had very good experiences and dealt with some very honest, hardworking people who do the very best job they can.

No. 2, there's a very fine line in terms of sales practices, and the word is puffing versus fraud. Everybody who's in sales has to engage in some

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 126

marketing. And the question is, at what point do you cross the line and be either civilly or criminally 3 acting illegally. And that's a very difficult line. 4 And in the area of telecommunications, and I've said 5 this before, it's not -- it is endemic to the 6 industry.

And, unfortunately, very unfortunately, not specific to Qwest, we're in a situation where Wall Street analysts, 26-year-old kids, are demanding people be fired in industries all across the country. And in telecommunications, we have an area that historically has been regulated and was deregulated first in long distance and now in local communications, once by a federal court, the second time by an act of Congress.

And we're in an area -- and I said this before, Mr. Chairman -- it's anarchy. And it's not just Owest. It's all of the telecommunications companies. And it's not rule of law, it's law of the jungle. And it's very unfortunate. And we have a huge amount of pressure being put on commissioned sales reps and outside companies, and that has undermined public confidence in the system.

So nobody is attacking you personally. And 25 as far as I'm concerned, Mr. Chairman, and I think I now that not only applies to Qwest but to all

telecommunications companies in the state to try to 3 prevent that unethical and outrageous behavior that's 4

been described. And that will be coming up for a vote in the near future.

I don't think we have any other speakers, as I understand it.

I said I would give counsel for Qwest opportunity to ask any questions that we might have.

Do you have any, Commissioner Spitzer? You can certainly ask him -- if he has a comments, we certainly want to hear them.

MR. FYKE: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, my name is Tim Fyke. I'm an attorney with the Qwest Corporation. My office is in Phoenix at 5090 North 40th Street in Phoenix, Arizona.

I suspect that it would probably be wise, first of all, to identify that I'm going to try to speak to the legal issues. I think one of the legal issues, though, that is here -- or that we should consider and what I've heard throughout the day is a comparison of telecommunications information and the private information that our customers legitimately -or the information that our customers have that they expect legitimately to be kept private and other

Page 127

speak for my colleagues, nobody is attacking the good 2 employees of Qwest or the other companies. I think 3 the problem is we have a corporate culture that has 4 recently gone to the extreme of quarterly earnings 5 mean everything. And if you live or die by quarterly 6 earnings report and you're not really concerned about even the long-term health of your company because you 8 have some Wall Street analyst on your back, what does 9 that say for the consumers.

And the problem I have as a commissioner is not the employees of the company. The problem I have as a commissioner is the public policy articulated by Mr. Smith. He ain't giving up. They're going to fight for opt-out till their dying breath. I think that's bad public policy. I also happen to think it's bad business, but I'm just a lawyer. What do I know.

17 But I thank you for coming down here. 18 COM. IRVIN: I wanted to thank you, too, for 19 that insight. And maybe as things -- Mr. Johnson, our 20 director of Utilities, might be interested in some of 21 your experiences for enforcement purposes. Thank you 22 for coming forth.

23 CHMN, MUNDELL: Let me just say, also, on a 24 different docket, we have cramming and slamming rulemaking that we're going through the process right 25

companies' information.

insurance information, my bank information, my brokers information, how many checks I write, to whom I write, that I write them to the doctor, that I write them for child support, whatever it happens to be, I consider that to be equally as sensitive and equally as private as the telecommunications information. So I would like to suggest that the comparison that we have sometimes heard about utility -- about the utility information with other information has not taken that I think properly into account for the record. So I did want to make that correction.

And I would say as a personal comment that my

CHMN. MUNDELL: Counsel, let me interrupt for a second. You heard one of the speakers, I think one of the more recent speakers, indicate that sort of the analogy -- and I have a six-year-old daughter. And just because everyone else does it, doesn't make it right. And so using that kind of argument it seems to me doesn't have a lot of merit at least for this commissioner. Just because everyone else does it, this may be the tip of the iceberg, and Congress may want to revisit all those statutes that I'm sure all the industry went back to Congress and got the law changes so this could occur. So the fact that

Page 129

Page 128

33 (Pages 126 to 129)

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2

Page 130

1 everyone else does it doesn't make it right. And it 2 seems to me that Owest could show good faith in being 3 the leader in trying to protect privacy rather than saying, everyone else does it, so we need to do it for 5 marketing. And that's my personal position on it, and 6 we'll listen to your legal arguments.

COM. SPITZER: Mr. Chairman, I think there's also a factual issue. And I would disagree. And my issue is telecommunications information, regulated utility, is different in kind with respect to privacy and more intrusive than a bank account. And what my hope is that a factual record be made to articulate that distinction.

I think you've gotten a flavor for the people of state of Arizona feel that there's a distinction, as well, but that future proceedings will further articulate this issue.

MR. FYKE: The point you made, Commissioner, is the reason I raised it. A significant number of people -- I know one of the public commenters indicated that she was equally concerned about insurance information and financial information, and we wanted to make sure that you understood that from

24 our view, that telecommunications information, while

COM. SPITZER: Mr. Chairman, if I may quote

it is private, we also think that these things are

Page 132

and to say that that should be applied to dictate that, in fact, the Qwest Communication -- the practice that Qwest proposed is improper I think does not, in 4 fact, address the correct legal issue, which I think 5

was addressed by the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals. COM. IRVIN: Mr. Chairman, if I could, before

6 7 Mr. Fyke continues, and I'm going to throw my two 8 cents in on this. While I'm not a lawyer and I get to 9 listen to many legal arguments, regardless -- and I'm 10 not going to debate the issue on the legality 11 standpoint whether it's legally right or the Tenth 12 Circuit was correct or wrong. I personally view they 13

14 Let's look at it from the standpoint that I 15 made the point earlier this morning and I'm 16 continually amazed that Qwest has refused to 17 acknowledge the fact that they're a regulated entity. 18 Every comparison that you and Mr. Smith and everybody 19 else has given has been the fact that on unregulated entities that you have choice. If I don't like the 20 21 way my bank is doing business, I can change banks. If 22 I don't like the products my grocery store delivers me 23 or sells me, I can change grocery stores. If I don't 24 like the products at the hardware store. I can change hardware stores. In this market and in the state of

Page 131

Arizona and for that matter within the entire Owest 2 region, it is a regulated entity that says, if I want

3 dial tone, I cannot go to anybody else but Qwest.

4 Now, I have a few options, albeit expensive 5 in rural areas. I have options to use cellular, which many people have exercised that option. But at the 7 same time, those people have expressed the desire to 8 have wire telecommunications services brought to their 9 home or business with the expectation that those 10 services that they have and that information is proprietary. And the distinction is they don't have 11 12 the ability to go out and say, I want a new local 13 telephone company. That service is not available.

When and if we ever get to that day in Arizona, which I hope someday we will, a marketing blunder like this on the part of Qwest could cost them potentially tens of thousands of customers based on what we've seen today. But the fact of the matter is this Commission has a responsibility to guard and present public policy and in the best interest of people.

The people have spoken today. They've spoken to your company. They have spoken all around this state saying that the policy stinks. That the way you're going about it is wrong.

private, as well.

3 from the Central Hudson decision, which is controlling authority from U.S. Supreme Court, Justice Rehnquist: 5 A public utility is a state-created monopoly. Indeed, the extensive regulations governing decision-making by 6 7 public utilities suggest that for purposes of First 8 Amendment analysis, a utility is far closer to a 9 state-controlled enterprise than is an ordinary 10 corporation. Accordingly, I think the state has broad discretion in determining the statements that a 11 utility may make in that such statements emanate from 12 13 the entity created by the state to provide important 14 and unique public services. And a state regulatory 15 body charged with the oversight of these types of 16 services may reasonably decide to impose on utilities 17 a special duty to conform its conduct to the agency's 18 conception of public interest. 19

That's from the United States Supreme Court. 20 MR. FYKE: And that is absolutely true, and 21 it is in the context of that case where they were, in 22 fact, not taking about telecommunications information. 23 It was decided in an entirely different context. Now, 24 that's not to say that it does not control at present. I'm simply saying to take that quote in that context

34 (Pages 130 to 133)

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

5

7

8

9

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 134

This Commission has an obligation. Maybe in Denver it's an appointed Commission and maybe some governor appointed those commissioners and thought it was a good idea. I don't know. But we are elected to represent the people for the people. Public policy of this state has been that we will provide telephone access to every Arizonan living in this state, regulated telephone access. And so it's from that standpoint that I look at this. And I can hear all 10 the arguments that you want; but for the phone company 11 to come in when consumers have no choice and give 12 their information to a family, as so eloquently was 13 pointed out, that includes aunts and uncles and third 14 cousins and fourth cousins, a family that's growing 15 and has not yet been defined. I think is morally and 16 ethically wrong albeit from a legal question.

And I would think that a publicly regulated entity that has the ability that has locked in rates that has locked in consumers would be willing and want to put forth the best interest of the community and the public not only for their own personal sake because this is in my opinion not only a black eye on the company, but surely it will take weeks, months, potentially years to re-get back the public trust. And we heard from one of your own former employees

that the decision does not prevent Owest, if they chose to do so, to have an opt-in provision. We've heard that you're not going to do that. You've drawn a line in the sand.

Anything else further that you want to add from a legal perspective that we need to know?

MR. FYKE: In terms of the legal issues, first of all, I would say I respect your views. I do not believe that that is a fair characterization. I 10 think the company does, in fact, care. But that's a 11 disagreement. I think Mr. Smith addressed that very 12 well.

With respect to the legal issues that you point out, I read the Court of Appeals of the Tenth Circuit case as agreeing that there is no requirement that a company independently on its own could not use an opt-in process. I read the FCC interim order as suggesting that that is possible. And I would point out to you that in the Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, in that opinion in the record before the FCC that took some like two years to create that resulted in the decision of the Court of Appeals for the Tenth

23 Circuit and in the current record before the FCC, it 24 is our view that the overwhelming support is in favor of an opt -- I'm going to blow this -- is in favor of

Page 135

from his experience -- that's why I asked the question -- of some things that he thought were wrong by the company and those practices. We haven't got into that. I don't know whether those are factual or not. But that was his experience he testified today.

The issue is consumer confidence. I think we started this morning off that consumer confidence is lacking with your company, and yet I and this Commission, my colleagues, we've heard very little to ease those fears. And that's not the legal issue, which, again, I defer a lot of those to my learned colleagues who have law degrees. But I look at it from listening to the public and doing my job as not only a regulator but as a voted official of the state. And what I'm hearing is the company is asking this Commission to recognize something, but the company's

17 refusing to hear what the people and the Commission is 18 saying. And that, to me, is troubling. 19 COM. SPITZER: Well said, Commissioner. 20 CHMN. MUNDELL: We discussed earlier I think 21 with Mr. Smith some of the legal aspects of the Tenth 22 Circuit decision, and we don't need to -- this isn't 23 the time or place to debate it more thoroughly than I 24 think we've already done. Suffice to say that, as I 25 said earlier, I think Mr. Smith acknowledged that,

Page 137

Page 136

1 an opt-out, not an opt-in. That an opt-in program 2 imposes unreasonable restrictions upon free speech. It imposes unreasonable restrictions on commerce. And 3 that the reverse, that it is, an opt-in -- I'm sorry. 5 That the opt-out permits those folks who care about 6 the privacy, who wants want to protect their 7 information, to be able to opt-out. 8

So I would disagree with you, respectfully, that, in fact, the record shows that there is some greater value or some greater benefit to an opt-in. I believe the reverse is true. The record shows clearly that the value is for an opt-out.

CHMN. MUNDELL: Well, and reasonable legal minds can differ on that, but you still need a sufficient notice so people can make an informed consent, if even you're going to have an opt-out. You'd agree with that?

MR. FYKE: We certainly do.

COM. IRVIN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to take that one step further. Based on the last census that Arizona has a Hispanic population between 22 to 25 percent of the general public, and not one word of this notice was printed in Spanish, no way -- or there is no Spanish options given on the call-in line now to Hispanic people to opt-out nor is there any Spanish

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 138

option given on the Internet that I'm aware of for Hispanic population to opt-out and make a reasonable 3 choice. So, therefore, I would even find not only is 4 the notice insufficient, but I would find even your 5 free speech argument -- you deny free speech to a very large segment of the population of the state by not 7 speaking in their language, which our schools are even 8 required to do, which our elected ballots are required 9 to do is put it in that language.

MR. FYKE: Mr. Commissioner, I cannot speak to whether or not the notice was in Spanish. I have not personally verified yes or no. I do know, though, that the Qwest Corporation has a Hispanic center in which our Spanish speaking customers may call. We deal with them regularly. And I can assure you that we are receiving calls into that center, that we receive opt-outs regularly, and that that is tracked and available. So first of all, I cannot tell you yes or no, we did or did not send it in Spanish. We are certainly going to look into that, and we'll give that you information.

No. 2, I can assure you that we have a Spanish center; that if you're a Spanish speaking customer of Qwest, you may call it, and we will deal with you in Spanish. And we would be very happy if violate the First Amendment as stated in the Tenth

- Circuit Court of Appeals because, as I read the FCC
- 3 interim order, it did talk about being able to -- the
- 4 possibility of drafting -- I think they use the word a
- flexible opt-in provision. I think that was the 5
- 6 terminology used in that interim order. So I would 7

request that we do those two things.

If we need to hold another meeting in order to comply with the open meeting law, that's fine. I don't know what we can do here today or what we can't do. But a letter to the FCC -- because the time period, I understand, is closed, we need to do that as soon as possible and also start the rulemaking process for an opt-in requirement.

And as I said earlier, I'm willing to go to court to defend that and protect the privacy concerns of the customers of Arizona.

COM. IRVIN: Mr. Chairman, before counsel talks on that, I'd like to make it all encompassing to hear his view on it. I'd like to extend your request on this order to open up -- first of all, I'd like to know if we could make it on an expedited matter since time is of the essence in this and since that information is looking at going out in a relatively

short order. And we've heard witnesses that are --

Page 139

Page 141

Page 140

vou would --

COM. IRVIN: Is that a 24-hour line, 800

MR. FYKE: It is the Spanish center. It is our regular business office for Spanish-speaking customers. They handle those across all 14 states.

COM. IRVIN: One line for all 14 states?

MR. FYKE: I don't have any idea how many representatives we have. I believe that the -- again, I should not being speaking to matters over which I am not familiar. I can assure you it is there. If you want more details about the Hispanic --

> COM. IRVIN: We won't go into that. MR. FYKE: We'll be glad to provide them. CHMN. MUNDELL: Thank you, counsel.

I would suggest at this time -- at least my preference would be -- and I'll look to our learned counsel, Mr. Kempley, for some advice.

But my first suggestion would be that we send a letter to the FCC supporting an opt-in provision.

That would be our preference as a state commission. Secondly, I would suggest that we open up a

22 23 rulemaking docket so that we can have a -- develop a 24 sufficient record so that we can attempt to have an 25 opt-in provision that is constitutional and does not

some have said that is going out as we speak.

The other thing I'd like to add is on the rulemaking. And if we are to do that and that there is a verification clause added in that whichever method is done, opt-in or opt-out, that it's verifiable and the consumers have those options.

And then, third, I would like to add, as I mentioned this morning, that I would like to explore the possibility and add to the rulemaking that the Commission, if the courts rule against this Commission and an opt-in, if that's what we elect to do, that we include rules to allow this Commission to make appropriate discount provision so that consumers can receive something and benefit, should their proprietary information be sold for the sole commercial use of a public utility.

CHMN. MUNDELL: And one last thing, Mr. Kempley, and I'll let Commissioner Spitzer state what his views are. I'd also like Staff to look at what our legal options are from the perspective of filing an injunction prior to the -- while the FCC finalizes their rules, whether or not that's even possible. So we don't -- so this information is not released while the FCC goes through their rulemaking process.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

2

3

4

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 142

Commissioner Spitzer.

COM. SPITZER: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I agree. And I don't know if today's the appropriate time, but I'd be happy to put the suggestions made by you and my colleague Commissioner Irvin in the form of a motion. It may be necessary to convene another meeting with regard to the FCC matter. But the docket should be initiated as quickly as possible consistent with due process to establish a record. And the ambit should be broad, should include recommendations consistent with the current state of the law regarding preempts.

I do understand -- my understanding of the current FCC rule -- interim rule is that there is -- the states are not precluded from adopting regulation that is consistent with the statute. And what is notable is the Tenth Circuit decision was a challenge by Qwest to the rule promulgated by the FCC. It is not a challenge to the constitutionality of section 222 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

adopt -- open a docket to initiate rulemaking by this
 Commission on the issue of privacy consistent with
 federal law. It should be done post haste, and I
 would be happy to, Mr. Chairman, make myself available

So I would agree that we certainly want to

Page 144

1 MR. KEMPLEY: I would suggest, point taken, and that you should anticipate that all arms of your 3 Staff will be actively engaged in trying to piece together a comprehensive rulemaking effort. As you 5 know, Commissioners, the rulemaking process is such 6 that in order to effectively create a rule, it's 7 necessary to do a significant amount of preliminary 8 work in order to have a pretty good conception of 9 where the rule is going to go before you first act on 10 the rule. And I'll just parenthetically note that

there is available is the possibility of an emergency rule in the event the situation is perceived as being of such importance that it's necessary to have a rule in force before the entire rulemaking process can be completed. We're aware of that, and that will be given consideration.

With respect to a couple of the other things that were mentioned from the bench --

CHMN. MUNDELL: Mr. Kempley, before you do that -- because I think I asked the question -- I don't expect a legal answer on those today, but all I wanted you to do is research the answer for us. And it's attorney-client privilege, so I don't want you to answer my question about whether we can go to federal court and get an injunction today. I don't expect you

Page 143

anytime that you wish to schedule a meeting in order to proceed as quickly as possible.

CHMN. MUNDELL: So, Mr. Kempley, what can or can't we do today based upon the open meeting notice? And then if we need to schedule an additional special open meeting in the next few days to actually vote on matters, we'll do that.

MR. KEMPLEY: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, Chris Kempley, chief counsel.

Let me start -- I'll try to respond in separate parts.

First, with respect to the question of a letter to the FCC, we will undertake drafting a letter for your consideration immediately. The issuance of such a letter on the part of all the commissioners may, in fact, require that you reconvene at some later date, but certainly we can have a draft available for review within a very few days.

Secondly, with regard to a rulemaking docket, that, of course, is an effort that will be a joint effort between the Legal Division and the Utilities Division of the Commission. I candidly don't think that we need any further instruction from the bench with regard to that.

COM. IRVIN: We were clear.

to answer that question today, but I want you to do that research.

COM, SPITZER: Mr. Chairman, if I may, without unduly adding to your burden, counsel, one of the aspects of this case that I think is interesting and noteworthy is that Arizona is one of the few jurisdictions in the entire United States where there's an express provision in our state Constitution granting the right to privacy. I believe it's Article 2, Section 4, of the state Constitution. That may be more reason why the people of the state of Arizona are so interested in guarding their privacy rights because the founding fathers of this state saw fit to put such an express provision in the state Constitution. Obviously, if there's a direct federal preemption, that provision may be of less utility. But given the current state of the law, I think that issue should be explored, as well, and with all due respect, Mr. Chairman, should be added to the research being conducted as part of this docket.

CHMN. MUNDELL: I appreciate that. In fact, I think as the Arizona Supreme Court said, Arizona is one of the first states whose founders thought it necessary to adopt explicit protection of the privacy of its citizens. And it's Godbehere vs. Phoenix

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

3

4

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

Page 146

Newspapers, Inc. So I appreciate you bringing that to 2 our attention, and certainly that's another area that we might have the ability as a state -- and I believe this is a states' rights issue, also, to go further 4 5 than the federal Constitution goes in protecting the 6 privacy of our citizens.

COM. IRVIN: Mr. Chairman, if I can -- excuse me, Mr. Kempley.

I'm going to make one last attempt. I'm going to ask Mr. Smith, Mr. Fyke, Ms. Wahlert, as representatives and employees of the company, if they would go back to Denver and with respect to the state of Arizona, that they would ask Denver to reconsider this and suspend the sharing of this information with respect to Arizona citizens until we get clarification from the FCC and the state of Arizona regarding this issue, which is, I think you have now discovered, which is vitally important to our citizens and is certainly on the radar screen of this Commission. And I would ask that the company would voluntarily respect the wishes of the citizens and withdraw this. And possibly even if you still want to do marketing, maybe come up with a better, more consumer friendly plan. Those are certainly within your purview, but I think that would go a long way to do some damage control

later date that's fairly soon, some of those things seem to me to be well within the bounds that Owest may make some movement on.

Page 148

Page 149

COM. IRVIN: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Kempley, and I certainly sent the challenge to them. But by no means would I want to send a signal from this bench at least from my standpoint that that would slow down the responsibility that the Chairman laid out in opening up the rulemaking docket like tomorrow or this afternoon, whichever is faster, and proceed along those lines.

MR. KEMPLEY: And, Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Irvin, I certainly didn't take any comments from the bench to mean that we should move less quickly than we possibly can.

CHMN. MUNDELL: Any other -- any final thoughts?

COM. SPITZER: Mr. Chairman, I do have one final thought; and that is, one of the framers of the U.S. Constitution at the convention in 1787 said in a query from a foreigner, "Here, sir, under this Constitution, the people govern." The people govern.

I want to take a moment to thank not only the people from the ordinary citizens who came down, took time away from their family or their jobs, to testify

Page 147

that's in your authority.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHMN. MUNDELL: Anything further?

MR. KEMPLEY: Mr. Chairman, just briefly, with respect to your legal options and the comments about the Arizona constitutional right of privacy, certainly we do believe that the existence of the right of privacy in the Arizona Constitution has an impact on the way this issue will be analyzed in

10 Arizona and the nature of the options that we will 11 ultimately present to you.

Commissioner Irvin's final statement leads me to a point that I was going to make; and that is, with respect to a couple of the specific requests that I heard coming from the bench that are -- the only word I can think of are ameliorative. I know that's too big a word to be using. But would mitigate the impact of the opt-out plan, such as extending the time from the March 29th date, seeking verification to customers.

21 My suggestion, I guess, consistent with the 22 Commissioner's comments, is that we should give Qwest 23 an opportunity to respond to those requests before we 24 finally decide where the line in the sand is precisely 25 drawn. And whether that response is today or at some

today. I want to thank the people who've called this

- office, my office, the Commission, Chairman Mundell's, 2
- 3 Commissioner Irvin's office, our Utilities office.
- Government in general, the Attorney General. I think
- 5 that's a tribute to the vitality of democracy in this
- country, that people are willing to participate in 6
- this process and state their views. We had a woman 7
- 8 who came down and supported the company. That's fine,
- 9 too. That's what this process, that's what democracy

10 is all about. 11

Alexander Hamilton said, "Here, sir, the people govern." It's not the companies that govern. It's not the politicians that govern. "Here, sir, the people govern." And I want to thank the people.

CHMN, MUNDELL: Thank you. Anything in closing?

COM. IRVIN: I think Commissioner Spitzer has summed it up eloquently.

Thank you, Commissioner.

20 CHMN. MUNDELL: Thank you. We'll stand 21 adjourned.

22 (The special open meeting concluded at 1:30 23 p.m.)

24 25

		Page 150
I	STATE OF ARIZONA)	
,) ss.	
2 3	COUNTY OF MARICOPA)	
4	I, CAROLYN T. SULLIVAN, Certified Court	
5 6	Reporter No. 50528 for the State of Arizona, do hereby certify that the foregoing printed pages constitute a	
7	full, true and accurate transcript of the proceedings	
8	had in the foregoing matter, all done to the best of	
10	my skill and ability. WITNESS my hand this 17th day of August,	
11	2002.	
12		
14		
١,,	CAROLYN T. SULLIVAN, RPR	
1.5	Certified Court Reporter Certificate No. 50528	
16		
17		
19		
20 21		
22		
23		
24 25		
		ļ
Ĺ		